Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-88-182
Tuesday
20 September 1988

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-88-182 *20 September 1988*

CONTENTS

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Aboymov on Pact Proposals, Western Reaction 1
'Confusion' in NATO Over Pact Initiatives *[Bogachev]* 1
U.S. Rejects Krasnoyarsk Proposals 2
Support for Austrian Proposal at Mandate Talks 2
'Top Priority' Program on Arms Control *[Kuznetsov, Bogdanov, Plekhanov]* 3
U.S. Nuclear Risk Reduction Center Described *[PRAVDA 15 Sep]* 6

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

Asian, U.S. Reactions to Gorbachev Speech *[PRAVDA 19 Sep]* 7
Gerasimov Holds Foreign Ministry Briefing 19 Sep 7
On U.S. Response to Gorbachev 7
Afghan Premier To Visit 8
Pakistani 'Breach' of Agreement 8
Fate of WWII Envoy Wallenberg 8
CW Ban Treaty Verifiable 9
More on Gerasimov 15 Sep News Conference *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 17 Sep]* 9
More on Gerasimov 14 Sep News Conference *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 16 Sep]* 10
43d UN General Assembly Agenda: 'Intense Work' 10
Soviet Priorities for Session 11
U.S. Departing From 'Negativism' *[PRAVDA 18 Sep]* 11
Europarliament Reviews Report on Soviet Ties 12
Soviet Delegation Leader Assesses Vienna Talks 12
Historians Mark Munich Agreement Anniversary 13

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

Tbilisi Forum Discusses U.S.-Soviet Ties 14
Adamishin, U.S. Official Cited 14
Roundtable Held on Soviet-U.S. Relations 15
IZVESTIYA on Carlucci Visit to PRC *[16 Sep]* 16
Paper Rebuts USIA Disinformation Allegations *[IZVESTIYA 16 Sep]* 17

Northeast Asia

Gorbachev 'Concern' for Japan's Defense Budget 18
Media Reaction to Proposals 18
Soviet Diplomat Cited on Relations With ROK *[Budapest]* 18

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Burma Beam Questions U.S. Plans To Halt Aid 18
More on Visit to Moscow by SRV's Vo Chi Cong 19
Hanoi Reports Arrival *[VNA]* 19
Holds Talks With Gromyko 19
Gromyko Hosts Kremlin Dinner 20
Gromyko Kremlin Speech *[PRAVDA 20 Sep]* 20
Vo Chi Cong Dinner Speech *[PRAVDA 20 Sep]* 22
Gromyko Presents Award 23
SRV Leaders Send Thanks for Jubilee Greetings *[PRAVDA 18 Sep]* 23

Philippines Welcomes Soviet Proposal on Bases 24
Katushev Receives Lao Economic Ties Official *[IZVESTIYA 15 Sep]* 24

Near East & South Asia

Indian President Greets Gromyko From Aircraft *[PRAVDA 18 Sep]* 24
Afghan Rebel on Help From U.S. 'Advisers' 24
Polyakov Meets With PLO Officials in Tunis *[IZVESTIYA 15 Sep]* 25
CPSU Delegation Departs for Damascus 16 Sep *[PRAVDA 17 Sep]* 25
Syrian Official Meets Group *[Damascus]* 26

East Europe

Polish Sejm Accepts Government's Resignation 26
Further on Sejm Session 26
Polish Politburo, Trade Union Discussion Noted *[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 16 Sep]* 26
Zaykov Completes Visit to Bulgaria, Returns *[PRAVDA 17 Sep]* 27
Hungarian Trade Unions' Shortcomings Viewed *[LITERATURNAYA GAZETA 14 Sep]* 27
TASS, CTK Press Agencies Sign Agreement *[IZVESTIYA 16 Sep]* 28

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Political & Social

Gorbachev's Krasnoyarsk Speech Published *[PRAVDA 18 Sep]* 29
Armenian Ministry Issues Statement on Clashes 41
Calls for Self-Restraint 41
Troops Reportedly Flown In *[AFP]* 41
Armenian Plenum on 'Stagnation,' Changes *[PRAVDA 16 Sep]* 42
Moldavia Adopts Decree on Demonstrations *[Kishinev SOVETSKAYA MOLDAVIYA 4 Aug]* 44
Role of Lithuanian Foreign Ministry Examined *[Vilnius]* 44
Turkmen Plenum, Food Supply Problems Viewed *[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 14 Sep]* 45
Ecological Service in Ukraine Reorganized *[Kiev PRAVDA UKRAINY 15 Sep]* 47
Cuts, Reorganization in Ukrainian Administration 47
Ukrainian Area Radiation Data Published *[Kiev PRAVDA UKRAINY 16 Sep]* 47
TRUD Article Assails Ukrainian Nationalists *[15 Sep]* 47
'Inflammatory' Nationalist Sentiments Deplored *[PRAVDA 15 Sep]* 50
Arbatov Discusses 'Political' Keys to Progress *[IZVESTIYA 13 Sep]* 51
Workers' Views on Election of Economic Leaders *[TRUD 15 Sep]* 55
Department To Collect, Publish Crime Statistics *[IZVESTIYA 10 Sep]* 56
Brezhnev Connection Aided Former Kray Chief *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 16 Sep]* 57

Agriculture

Nikonov, Slyunkov, Others View Feed Harvesters *[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 14 Sep]* 58
Attend Vegetable Growing Seminar *[PRAVDA 15 Sep]* 59
Progress on Harvest of Feed Crops Described *[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 16 Sep]* 59
Official Data on Harvest, Sowing, Feed Crops 60
Altay Grain Harvest Progress Reported *[PRAVDA 17 Sep]* 61

Aboymov on Pact Proposals, Western Reaction

LD1909121188 Moscow TASS in English 1152 GMT 19 Sep 88

[Text] Moscow September 19 TASS—The proposals which were put forward in Mikhail Gorbachev's speech in the Polish Sejm and in the final documents of the Warsaw session of the Political Consultative Committee (PCC) of the Warsaw Treaty member states play a big role in normalising the situation in Europe, maintains Ivan Aboymov, deputy minister of foreign affairs of the USSR.

"The proposals have been positively regarded in practically all NATO countries, which is evidenced by numerous pronouncements by political and public figures," he said in an interview with a TASS diplomatic correspondent.

"Such reaction became possible due to the readiness of socialist countries to look for points of contact with the stands of other countries, and due to non-confrontational character of the documents which were adopted at the PCC session in July and which take into account the interests of NATO countries as well."

There are ever more frequent calls in the West for unilateral disarmament of WTO [Warsaw Treaty Organization] countries as a means for removing the disbalances in the armed forces and armaments. Ivan Aboymov pointed out that "such calls are a tactical manoeuvre by those forces which want to divert the attention of the public from the Warsaw Treaty countries' proposals to give a strictly defensive character to the armed forces of the two military and political alliances".

Interest in Europe has been generated by the idea of establishing a war risk reduction centre which could become an additional instrument for cooperation between European countries and for building trust between them, the deputy minister of foreign affairs of USSR went on to say.

At the Warsaw session, WTO countries for the first time collectively expressed their opinion on the problem of ecology. "Cooperation in the field of ecology could undoubtedly become an element which would contribute to drawing East and West closer together," he said.

WTO countries' activity are based on a striving for collective efforts which could promote the implementation of the Warsaw session initiatives. "The Jakes plan in Czechoslovakia, the Jaruzelski plan in Poland, the proposal by the SDPG [Socialist Democratic Party of Germany] and the SUPG [Socialist Unity Party of Germany] on the establishnment of a zone of trust and security in Central Europe and other initiatives are steps leading to lower military confrontation on the continent, and stages on the way to real European security," Ivan Aboymov said.

'Confusion' in NATO Over Pact Initiatives

LD1609181588 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1423 GMT 16 Sep 88

[Text] Moscow, 16 Sep (TASS)—TASS observer on military matters, Vladimir Bogachev, writes:

Washington has struck a blow at the hopes of the world public that NATO will produce a sensible response this fall to the Warsaw Pact proposals on reduction of armed forces and conventional armaments in Europe, and that appropriate negotiations will begin before the new president arrives in the White House.

U.S. State Department spokesman Charles Redman stated at a briefing for journalists that promises by officials in Washington to find a formula for negotiations by the end of August were not fulfilled due to disagreements between the United States and the Soviet Union on human rights problems.

For a long time NATO has used the pretext of the "overwhelming superiority of the Warsaw Pact" in conventional weapons to impede progress at the talks on nuclear and space weapons and to prevent the creation in Europe of zones free of nuclear and chemical weapons. Now that the countries of the socialist community are offering to begin deep reductions of armed forces and conventional weapons with the exchange of information on the military potential of the two military alliances, and with the leveling out of this potential of the two sides according to separate indicators, the Atlanticists are going into reverse. It is evident that the prospect of a normalization of the military and political situation in Europe arouses far greater alarm in certain circles in Washington than the asymmetry in the armed forces of the Warsaw Pact and NATO.

Right from the start, Washington's reaction to the Warsaw Pact initiatives has been contradictory and inconsistent. The Atlanticists have called the proposals of the socialist community first "unacceptable," then "businesslike and reassuring."

Evidently, the confusion among NATO ranks in the face of "the new peace offensive of the Warsaw Pact" is indeed explained by the noncoincidence of interests of the individual countries of the alliance. One cannot exclude that the uncertainty caused by the forthcoming presidential elections in the United States has also hindered NATO in working out a united stand on Warsaw Pact proposals quickly enough. Perhaps it is for this reason that NATO could find no better pretext for dragging out the solving of the problem of conventional forces and weapons, than fabricated differences on human rights.

However, it is also true that, essentially, Washington's stand on the reduction of armed forces and conventional weapons in Europe from the Atlantic to the Urals has, from the very start, been negative.

Evidently, the leaders of the United States and the other NATO countries are not yet ready to give up their plans to achieve military superiority on the European Continent. Obviouisly, the stereotypes of the prenuclear age are still too deeply embedded in the minds of politicians and military figures in the highest echelons of NATO.

U.S. Rejects Krasnoyarsk Proposals

LD1909211588 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 19 Sep 88

[Dialogue between commentators Aleksandr Ruvinskiy and Viktor Levin—live]

[Text] [Ruvinskiy] We have already talked about the responses to Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's proposals for strengthening peace and security in Asia. One can say with full justification that the new initiatives from the Soviet Union have aroused great interest in the world. However, it would be incorrect not to see that far from everyone welcomes our country's proposals. First and foremost I mean the United States, specifically its attitude to the proposal to set up, at the site of the Krasnoyarsk radar station, a center for international cooperation on using space for peaceful purposes. The White House, in rejecting this proposal, also repeats its demand for this radar station to be demolished. Such a report has been published by THE NEW YORK TIMES. Next to me is our foreign affairs commentator Viktor Levin. I will ask him to explain what lies behind the U.S. stance.

[Levin] The hurried negative reaction from the U.S. Administration puts one on one's guard. However, in my view one ought to note that U.S. President Reagan stated his desire to study the new Soviet proposals closely, and therefore—at least I would like to think so—it may be premature to regard the negative reaction as final. That is the hope, so to speak, but for the time being the spokesmen of the U.S. Administration are making very categorical statements.

What do they mean? For years now there has been talk in the United States about the Krasnoyarsk radar station being a violation of the ABM Treaty. The Soviet Union has not ignored the anxiety expressed across the ocean, and has taken a number of highly constructive steps. I will remind you of two of them. We invited U.S. senators to the Krasnoyarsk radar station so that they could see for themselves the unfounded nature of the allegations regarding violation of the ABM Treaty. The senators agreed that the radar station did not constitute a violation, but, they noted gravely, it could become a violation.

[Ruvinskiy] Why did they make such a statement?

[Levin] These days probably any radar station can be used for various purposes. Therefore, the matter of what may be, if something else is done, clouds the issue to a great extent. Everthing depends on the wishes and intentions, in this case in point—if we are talking about the Krasnoyarsk radar station—of the Soviet Union. We have stated our intentions with the utmost clarity. We—and here I am talking about the second step—have expressed our readiness to dismantle the equipment of this station if there is successful agreement on the observance of the 1972 ABM Treaty. However, this option did not suit the United States. What draws attention to itself here is the fact that the United States is using the matter of the Krasnoyarsk radar station in order to justify procrastination at the Geneva talks on the reduction of strategic offensive arms. The U.S. side has just about taken this problem to the very limit by stating that as long as the Krasnoyarsk radar station exists, there can be no agreement on the reduction of strategic offensive arms.

[Ruvinskiy] In familiarizing oneself with the comments in the foreign press on the new Soviet proposals, one's attention is drawn to an article in the West German newspaper GENERAL-ANZEIGER. It writes, and I quote: No one can doubt the sincerity of the initiatives that have been put forward. This is stressed in the proposal to turn the controversial Krasnoyarsk radar station into an international space center. Thus—I am still quoting—an elegant response has been given to the categorical demand for its removal by the United States.

[Levin] The response is elegant indeed. Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev stressed that we have decided once and for all to cut the ground from under the feet of those engaged in delaying the Geneva talks, and to present those who are genuinely concerned with irrefutable evidence of the unfounded nature of their doubts. But for the time being one has to note that the United States is also trying to ignore this proposal.

[Ruvinskiy] But aren't there some other reasons for it being advantageous for certain circles in the United States to keep returning to the matter of the Krasnoyarsk radar station?

[Levin] There are such reasons. The Americans themselves are building radar stations in Britain and Greenland that really do violate the ABM Treaty, violate it outright, as they say. But the United States prefers to hold its tongue about this. This is a flagrant example of a double standard, or rather, to put it more mildly, a lack of standards. Nonetheless, I will repeat: One would like to hope very much that Washington has still not given its final word regarding the truly elegant response by our country on the Krasnoyarsk radar station, for a stubborn no is far from the best description of the U.S. stance.

Support for Austrian Proposal at Mandate Talks

LD1909120388 Moscow TASS in English 1123 GMT 19 Sep 88

[Text] Vienna September 19 TASS—A regular session was held here today within the framework of consultations on the elaboration of a mandate for future talks on reducing the armed forces and conventional arms in Europe, from the Atlantic to the Urals.

At the session the Soviet delegation officially announced that the Soviet Union supports the proposal of the Austrian Republic that the above-mentioned talks of 23 member states of the Warsaw Treaty and North Atlantic Treaty Organisation as well as talks of 35 CSCE countries on confidence- and security-building measures in Europe be held in Vienna, the capital of Austria.

'Top Priority' Program on Arms Control
LD1709173288 Moscow in English to North America 2300 GMT 16 Sep 88

["Top Priority" program, hosted by Pavel Kuznetsov, with Radomir Bogdanov and Sergey Plekhanov]

[Text] [Kuznetsov] How do you do, ladies and gentlemen. Welcome to "Top Priority." I'm Pavel Kuznetsov, your host. Together with me in the studio are Radomir Bogdanov and Sergey Plekhanov.

Our Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze and Secretary of State George Shultz will meet in Washington, D.C. on 22 and 23 September. Is it going to be their 27th or 28th meeting?

[Plekhanov] I lost count.

[Bogdanov] You—I'm not sure, I'm sorry. Ha-ha! Lost count!

[Kuznetsov] Well, anyway, anyway, they will discuss arms control, regional conflicts, and some other bilateral issues, and I think that these two outstanding men have been very instrumental in promoting arms control and improving the political climate in Soviet-American relations. And they've also done a lot for the substantial washing away of the traditional enemy images and stereotypes. One of those stereotypes is the Soviet military threat. My question is this: Is this Soviet threat, quote-unquote, still a major factor in the behavior of the West in its foreign policy? Is it still comparable to a knee-jerk reflex? Dr Bogdanov?

[Bogdanov] Well, Pavel, I'm afraid that there is a lot of reason in what you say. I've been following very closely lately what's going on in the West in that, and you may notice that quite a number of different committees, different bodies, different alliances, like Atlantic, they are there together just to discuss that problem.

[Kuznetsov] You mean the Soviet threat?

[Bogdanov] Yes. Soviet threat, but under, under one angle: the Soviet threat and the future of disarmament (?at one), and you have a number of reports, studies, analyses, trying to convince the public opinion that the Soviet threat not only diminished—no, it's just growing. And you have a number of very responsible statements from different quarters and different sources supporting that view, on the level of defense secretaries, on the level of foreign ministers, that, gentlemen, don't believe. The Soviet threat is still there, and we have to spend a lot of money. Now my point is that the main item in all that, on that menu, is military appropriations. People are worried about the coming sessions, parliamentary and congressional sessions, when some more money should be appropriated for military expenses, and if there's no very old used image of the Soviet threat, it's becoming more and more difficult to find, to press the loan-makers to provide money for this absolutely useless expense. Now, my question is that you have a very funny, you have a very funny picture, if you like, some very funny waves of mood in the West. You have the wave of accusation of the Soviet Union. Why don't you do this and that? Why don't you disarm? Why don't you withdraw—when we started all that, you have another wave. Don't trust them! It's a cosmetic! It has nothing to do with the reality!

[Kuznetsov] But now there are inspections, and the United States and their—and its allies are able to verify...

[Bogdanov, interrupting] Yes, but that's becoming, that's becoming really, it's more and more difficult to convince your own public opinion that the Soviet Union is cheating. Now you have another trick. In all these reports I have mentioned there is one point: Arms control would not bring about any savings in the expenses. Even more, we will have to spend more because of inspection, because of destruction of existing arms systems, and it sounds such a fantastic—you know, that you look at that with amazement!

[Kuznetsov] But I've come across an article recently in the leading Soviet daily, PRAVDA, saying that the total, the net savings of the Soviet Union because of the destruction of missiles under the INF Treaty will be around R300 million. Does it not apply, the same apply to the West, when they destroy their own missiles?

[Bogdanov] I believe it does apply in millions, in millions of dollars saved on arms control. But, but you know, the funny thing is that you have a lot of publications on military expenses but you have no, or almost no publications, for saving money on disarmament. They just hide this information.

[Kuznetsov] Yes, my question to Dr Plekhanov: to the broad public in the West, the notion, the concept of a Soviet military threat, means only one thing: that the Soviets are supposed to be very safe and secure, and nobody, and nothing threatens them, while in the West, they are not secure and not safe, and that the Soviets hold such a terrific, such an overwhelming military advantage over them, that to keep us at bay, to be secure, they have to keep arming. And in this connection I'd like you to comment on the recent article, also in PRAVDA, by Marshal Akhromeyev of the Soviet General Staff, in which he discussess the situation existing currently in the navies of the two countries.

[Plekhanov] Well, you know, in the naval area, the United States has always had a superiority, and in fact when the Reagan administration came to power, their aim was to maintain the advantage that they have traditionally had in the naval capability. The only advantage that we are supposed to have is in the numbers of submarines which...

[Kuznetsov, interrupting] Multipurpose attack submarines.

[Plekhanov] Yes.

[Kuznetsov] Antiship weapons.

[Plekhanov] Yes, yes. But overall the United States is a martime power. It's more dependent on the ocean, and it has traditionally held an upper hand in their naval power over the Soviet Union. I would like to take an issue with you, a point that you made, namely that the public in the West thinks that the Soviet Union is stronger militarily than the United States. I think that perception has shifted in the past few years. In the United States now, according to the public opinion polls, Americans are inclined to think that the the United States is now stronger than the Soviet Union, and that is directly linked with their support of arms control, arms reduction measures, because they are not worried that the United States is sort of weakening itself in its negotiations with the Soviet Union, because of course the negotiations are based on the idea that both sides reduce their arsenals. And so the public is not worried about that. The perception that the Soviet Union is threatening the United States militarily has somewhat dissipated in the past few years, and that is exactly what is worrying the military planners, because if the public is less scared of the Soviets, then the public is less prepared to spend a lot of money on weapons. And when talk in political circles shifts from building up weapons to destroying weapons, and this like that, then of course it bodes ill for those people who live off weapons production and weapons maintenance.

[Kuznetsov] Yes, but I think you will agree with me that all we hear is that the Soviet Union has more of everything. I haven't heard a single discussion, or a conference, or a publication saying that the United States has a lot more than the Soviet Union has in certain fields.

[Bogdanov] Pavel, I'm sorry.

[Kuznetsov] That is why I think, that is why I think, though I watch the international wire services very closely, I haven't come across a single comment on Sergey Akhromeyev's article, where, which says explicitly and very candidly—there's even a lot of figures proving that the U.S. Navy, especially its aircraft carrier task forces, have a terrific nuclear punch.

[Bogdanov] Look...

[Kuznetsov, interrupting] They're very powerfu!.

[Bogdanov] Look, I would like to stress one point. Nobody denies that right to America.

[Kuznetsov] Yes, I agree.

[Bogdanov] To defend and to have their communications safe. What it's all about: Let's have it in the fair way, in the fair way.

[Kuznetsov] No, the main point of that article, excuse me.

[Bogdanov] Yes.

[Kuznetsov] Was that the U.S. Navy has outgrown its defensive purposes, so to say.

[Bogdanov] Yes, you have asymmetry in the conventional forces.

[Kuznetsov] Yes. Not (?only) in the conventional.

[Bogdanov] Yes. And we are, our—and we are ready to cut that asymmetry and to make fair gain with the other side. But my problem is: If you cut your asymmetry in the land forces, what about the other side's superiority in the navy? You see my point? You see my point?

[Kuznetsov] Yes, I do. That was the point brought up by Marshal Akhromeyev.

[Bogdanov] So my... [changes thought] Yes, but I would like to stress that point. It is not just our insistence that those Americans should not have that huge Navy, no! It's a fair game: You want us to cut our conventional forces to its proper size. Okay. But what about your Navy superiority? I wouldn't like to say: make. [as heard] I would like to have at least a shirt on me. You know, that's my logic, whether you will agree with it or not, but I just would like to explain.

[Kuznetsov] Well, I think that we'll be...

[Bogdanov, interrupting] Americans are common-sense people, and I believe in their common sense.

[Kuznetsov] Yes, I believe that we'll be left with more than one shirt on, even if we cut our nuclear arsenals by half.

[Bogdanov] No, no, no! I don't talk about nuclear yet! Maybe my...

[Kuznetsov, interrupting] You mean conventional?

[Bogdanov] Yes. But I mean, you should have a balanced balance. Balanced force, that's my point.

[Kuznetsov] Yes, I see. Dr Bogdanov, I think you mentioned the recent conference in The Hague, Holland, when you said...

[Bogdanov, interrupting] Yes, I, I mentioned...

[Kuznetsov, interrupting] When you said that some disarmament experts contend that by trying to disarm we'll push up defense spending, because of those inspections involved, and the destruction of nuclear missiles, which is costly, and so on and so forth. In this respect I also followed the conference in The Hague, and I would like to draw your attention to one, just one point made by those experts. Since many NATO countries seem to be reluctant to increase their defense spending for fear of hurting living standards, one of the arguments in favor of the arms race was that less spending on defense, or even freezing it at the current levels, would undercut Western pressure on the Soviet Union for more disarmament. And I don't quite get the, the logic, Sergey: If disarmament is useful, why try to achieve it by exerting pressure on the Soviet Union?

[Bogdanov] I would say more under...

[Kuznetsov, interrupting] Yep! For more military spending. But if disarmament is not useless, er, useful, if it is bad, why exert any pressure on Moscow at all? Let's keep arming until we exhaust each other.

[Bogdanov] This is nothing else but intimidation philosophy.

[Plekhanov] Now that reminds me of a classic saying by, actually a report by an American major during the war in Vietnam: We had to destroy the village to save it. And I'm afraid this is the same logic: We have to destroy the world in order to save it from, from something, and the arms race is a sure way of doing that. I, I think that this is just one of those desperate attempts to ward off the changes that are coming into world politics, because really the cycle of threat-mongering and intimidating each other and spending more and more on arms which cannot be used without destroying the whole world—this cycle is being broken because it's simply not in line with the real needs of the world, including East and West, North and South.

Disarmament has actually made a breakthrough. The process of disarmament has started. Let's face it: The INF Treaty is the first step. We have turned the corner, by having signed that treaty. And, well, of course, there's going to be pressures to the contrary, there's going to be resistance, fierce resistance by those forces and those people who are, who simply cannot imagine a world without armaments or without the arms race. But you know, the arguments, I think, are going to be more and more specious, and more and more, er, less, less and less persuasive with a lot of people, and in the final analysis it's the public opinion that will decide these issues.

[Kuznetsov] And think, and I think that a very useful role in washing away the enemy images and stereotypes is being played currently by the United States, which is in the forefront, together with the Soviet Union, of arms control and disarmament. They've recently destroyed some of their Pershings, and we've watched it on television, and also Tomahawk they've withdrawn their Tomahawks, missiles from Great Britain. And I think it's...

[Plekhanov, interrupting] Yeah, yeah.

[Kuznetsov] It's going to be more and more difficult for American officials, who are themselves showing an example of how to disarm and destroy (?nuclear) missiles, to, ah—it will be more difficult for them to convince the rest of the world, and their own allies, in the first place, that arms control is bad. Now, I think we agree that the Soviet military threat, quote-unquote, I keep repeating it, achieves a very good propaganda purpose among other things. One of them is supposed to be to hold the Western alliance together, which is supposed to be threatened by the Soviet Union, so to have an external enemy is supposed to be, still supposed to be, very important to bring those countries together. But I think that when you...[changes thought] Other real problems on a world scale that should unite us, like the greenhouse effect, ecological pollution, AIDS, what else? The effect of the ozone hole, which is...

[Bogdanov, interrupting] Pavel, but to deal with that...

[Kuznetsov, interupting] The destruction of a certain layer in the atmosphere, protective layer.

[Bogdanov] To deal with that you do not need NATO or Warsaw Treaty. You need something else.

[Plekhanov] You need the United Nations.

[Bogdanov] This is fake danger, the Soviet threat. But we have real dangers we have to deal with. And NATO and Warsaw Pact are no good for that. It's obsolete, it's, it's just for—for nothing! For nothing!

[Plekhanov] (?They are) tools which were built during the cold war, in order to wage the cold war. And as we are transcending the cold war framework, then new institutions are necessary—or institutions like the United Nations. The strength of the United Nations is that it is a universal organization. It represents everyone in the world, and it has a democratic mechanism to represent the views and to express the views of the world community. Now, I know that it's not very popular to talk about the United Nations in the United States, but I think that this is an organization which is far from exhausted, having exhausted its potential: In fact it is coming into its own; the real great days of the United Nations are still ahead, because there is nothing to replace it as a world body.

[Kuznetsov] Ah, I think that there's been more praise these days of the United Nations, and coming not only from the Soviet Union. You once accused me of lavishing praise on the United Nations to be able to share the laurels of...

[Bogdanov, interrupting] Yes, I did, I'm sorry for that.

[Plekhanov] I presume, yes.

[Kuznetsov] Secretary General Mr Perez de Cuellar, who was also announced to be on the list of Nobel Prize candidates in Oslo.

Thank you, gentlemen, for coming to the studio and sharing your views with us, and thanks to all of our listeners who are tuned in to the show, "Top Priority," and I invite you to stay tuned and join us again next time, a week from now. I'm Pavel Kuznetsov, your host, signing off.

U.S. Nuclear Risk Reduction Center Described

PM1609094988 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Sep 88 Second Edition pp 1, 5

[Article by PRAVDA correspondent V. Gan : "For the Sake of Common Security"]

[Text] Washington, 14 Sep—...It is extremely difficult to get to this room on the seventh floor of the U.S. State Department, even if you have special permission. After negotiating one pair of amazingly massive steel-clad doors, you first enter a tiny lobby. Once again a code has to be dialed, and only then will the electronic locks in the second pair of doors let you into a room covered with a light-colored carpet. This is not large either, and can take a maximum of 15-20 people if need be. On the wall there are three electronic clocks showing the time in Washington, Moscow, and Greenwich. On tables made of dark wood there are four computer terminals—two transmitting, one receiving, and one reserve—several photocopying machines, and a console with flashing lights. That is all the equipment. Outwardly the room scarcely conveys its importance for Soviet-U.S. relations, for mutual and universal security. It is called the Nuclear Risk Reduction Center.

On 15 September it will be a year since the USSR and the United States signed the agreement to set up in Moscow and Washington these centers which have become the embodiment of our two countries' willingness to cooperate in the interests of averting nuclear war. In a certain sense the centers have laid down a channel of trust between the Soviet and U.S. capitals, ensuring progress toward greater predictability and openness on military questions. Their main practical purpose is to transmit information on ballistic missile launches beyond the limits of national territory toward other countries, and those which represent a danger to shipping or aircraft. When the treaty between the USSR and the United States on eliminating intermediate- and shorter-range missiles came into force, the centers took on the role of leading link in the exchange of information essential for the treaty's effective verification.

In fact, 10 minutes before our conversation with David Schwartz, the head of staff at the center, the U.S. center received from Moscow several reports at the same time concerning the treaty on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles. According to the monitoring procedure, Schwartz said, very many reports are needed, and they all go through the center. Since 1 June alone more than 800 messages have been received about this treaty, which gives an idea not only about the scale of activity but also about the necessity and usefulness of this bilateral link.

Schwartz heads 17 staffers who ensure the center's round-the-clock operation. Each shift consists of two people—a communications specialist and a diplomat with Russian language capability. Computer technology makes it possible to send messages at a speed of 6,400 words per minute via two communications satellites—a Soviet and an American one.

The center began operations in April this year, dealing at the first stage with the transmission of all kinds of information stipulated by the agreements on measures to reduce the danger of a nuclear war and on averting incidents at sea and in the airspace above it. Now the main work is connected with the fulfillment of the treaty on intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles.

In contrast to the 25-year-old "hot line" set up for both states' highest leaders with the aim of regulating crises, the centers, Schwartz noted, are intended to avert them. The task is to help prevent crises from emerging and to establish trust in relations between the two countries. So it is difficult to overestimate the significance of these centers. Schwartz said that in the event of the sides achieving an agreement on a 50-percent reduction of strategic weapons, the centers in Moscow and Washington will play a major role in its implementation....

Asian, U.S. Reactions to Gorbachev Speech

PM1909132988 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 19 Sep 88 Second Edition p 5

[PRAVDA/TASS 18 September roundup: "For the Strengthening of Peace and Trust"]

[Text] While solving the tasks of restructuring, the Soviet Union is trying to strengthen peace and trust among peoples with its foreign policy. This is the key idea running through the foreign response to M.S. Gorbachev's Krasnoyarsk speech, which remains at the focus of the world's attention.

Hanoi [subhead]

Vietnam's NHAN DAN describes the new peace initiatives put forward by the Soviet leader in Krasnoyarsk as living proof of the Soviet Union's commitment to a peace-loving foreign policy course. "On reading the CPSU Central Committee general secretary's speech even the most implacable skeptic will hardly find arguments capable of providing grounds for accusing the USSR of trying to secure unilateral advantages," the newspaper writes. "Consistently implementing the principles proclaimed 2 years ago in Vladivostok, the USSR gives no chance to those who dislike the positive changes now taking place in the situation on the Asian Continent. The new Soviet initiatives conform with the innermost aspirations of peoples in the planet's most populous continent. This is why it is necessary to pool efforts for their joint implementation."

Beijing [subhead]

"We would very much like to normalize our relations with the Soviet Union," Li Peng, premier of the PRC State Council, declared in reply to an AP correspondent's question about his reaction to the proposals to fully normalize relations between the USSR and China, which came from Krasnoyarsk. "Our task is to restore our relations at a normal level," the premier went on. "This would be advantageous for the PRC and the USSR, and also for the cause of peace throughout the world." Li Peng expressed confidence that, if both sides continue to aim for progress in the solution of important problems, the question of a Soviet-Chinese summit meeting could appear on the agenda.

Jakarta [subhead]

The Soviet Union's proposals to strengthen peace and trust in the Asia-Pacific region were welcomed with great interest in Indonesia. The leading newspapers front-paged in detail the basic elements of the Soviet leader's speech. MERDEKA emphasizes the importance of M.S. Gorbachev's statement that, aware of the concern of countries in Asia and the Pacific, the USSR will not build up its nuclear arms in the Asia-Pacific region, as well as his call to the United States and the other nuclear powers not to site additional stockpiles of nuclear weapons in this region.

Washington [subhead]

M.S. Gorbachev's proposals that the USSR and the United States renounce on a "symmetrical basis" facilities in Vietnam's Cam Ranh Bay and the Philippines is obviously timed to coincide with the deadlock at the Washington-Manila talks on military bases, a CBS-TV anchorman noted. But this proposal was greeted without enthusiasm in the administration's top echelons.

An observer from another U.S. television company, ABC-TV, reported: "White House Press Secretary M. Fitzwater rejected out of hand the idea of using the Krasnoyarsk radar station as a base for creating a center for international cooperation in the peaceful use of outer space. M.S. Gorbachev has again forced the United States to take the position of the side which says 'no' to arms control proposals."

Delhi [subhead]

The new proposals for demilitarizing the Asia-Pacific region put forward by M.S. Gorbachev in Krasnoyarsk are perceived here as a very important peace initiative.

The newspaper PATRIOT singles out M.S. Gorbachev's words that the Soviet proposals, put forward 2 years ago in Vladivostok, generated profound interest in most Asian and Pacific countries, that the changes which started occurring after that led to the Geneva agreements on Afghanistan, and that those agreements in turn gave impetus to the settlement of other regional conflicts. The INDIAN EXPRESS gives special attention to the proposal to hold an international conference in 1990 on turning the Indian Ocean into a zone of peace. And the TIMES OF INDIA opens its report with an outline of M.S. Gorbachev's proposals for a simultaneous elimination of U.S. and Soviet bases in the Philippines and Vietnam respectively, a freeze on the deployment of nuclear arms in the region, and Gorbachev's readiness for talks with Deng Xiaoping, and describes the new Soviet proposals as a far-reaching step toward strengthening Asian security.

Gerasimov Holds Foreign Ministry Briefing 19 Sep

On U.S. Response to Gorbachev

LD1909150188 Moscow TASS in English 1455 GMT 19 Sep 88

[Text] Moscow September 19 TASS—Mikhail Gorbachev's speech in Krasnoyarsk evoked broad favourable reaction in the world, a Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman said.

Gennadiy Gerasimov, head of the ministry's Information Directorate, at a briefing today cited U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz as saying at the Asia Society in Washington that after the Afghan problem began to be solved the Asia-Pacific region was witnessing the development of a positive process of settling regional conflicts and normalising the situation throughout the region with the participation of China and the Soviet Union.

"We positively assess this statement by Mr. Shultz," Gerasimov said.

"This shows that proposals contained in Gorbachev's speech in Krasnoyarsk, correctly take into account specific features of the situation in the Asia-Pacific region and the trend toward constructive dialogue."

On the other hand, the spokesman said, "the desire of the Soviet side to allay Washington's doubts as to the real purpose of the facility in Krasnoyarsk, whose existence does not violate the ABM Treaty, as the Soviet side has more than once stated, comes up against lack of understanding on the U.S. part".

Gerasimov said in this connection that the U.S. side apparently was trying to use inventions about the Krasnoyarsk radar "to lay the blame at the wrong door" and have a free hand for actually scrapping the ABM Treaty and opening the door to implementation of the 'Star Wars' programme.

The Foreign Ministry spokesman emphasised that the issue of the destiny of the Krasnoyarsk radar needed to be given serious thought, and voiced the hope that "the new political thinking and the new approach to achieving accord will ultimately win".

Afghan Premier To Visit

LD1909175988 Moscow TASS in English 1737 GMT 19 Sep 88

[Text] Moscow September 19 TASS—Afghan Prime Minister Mohammad Hasan Sharq, who arrived in Moscow on an official visit today, is to have a meeting with Mikhail Gorbachev Tuesday, a spokesman for the Soviet Foreign Ministry said.

Gennadiy Gerasimov, head of the Soviet Foreign Ministry's Information Directorate, was speaking at a briefing for Soviet and foreign newsmen today.

The Soviet and Afghan sides are also to sign a long-term programme for bilateral cooperation in technology and trade and agreements on Soviet credits for top priority work envisaged by the programme.

Asked about the Soviet Union's reaction to the military coup in Burma, Gerasimov said: "It is not clear yet how events will develop, and we think it too early to give any assessments of the situation there."

Commenting on a report by the Indian newspaper NATIONAL HERALD which said that Pakistan had approached the creation of nuclear weapons, the Soviet diplomat said: "The Soviet Union cannot remain indifferent to circumstances like that. We have repeatedly told this to the Government of Pakistan and a number of other countries."

Pakistani 'Breach' of Agreement

LD1909162288 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1520 GMT 19 Sep 88

[Text] Moscow 19 Sep (TASS)—A meeting between Afghan Prime Minister Mohammad Hasan Sharq, who has arrived in Moscow for an official friendly visit, and Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, is scheduled for 20 September. This was announced at a briefing for Soviet and foreign journalists by Gennadiy Gerasimov, head of the Information Department of the USSR Foreign Ministry.

The USSR Foreign Ministry spokesman informed the journalists that the Afghan Ministry of Foreign Affairs has published a white paper "Fulfillment of the Geneva Agreements in the Interests of Mankind." The paper details the progress of the national reconciliation process, the fulfillment by the Afghan and Soviet sides of their obligations under the Geneva agreements, and also Pakistan's breach of these agreements. The paper also speaks of U.S. actions which serve to continue the undeclared war against Afghanistan.

The USSR Foreign Ministry spokesman rejected the Pakistani Foreign Ministry claims of violation of Pakistani air space by three Afghan aircraft. "All accusations against the Afghan side regarding the bombing of Pakistani territory by Afghan aircraft—as indeed of artillery bombardments—are pure fabrication designed to cover up their own crude violations of the Geneva agreements and their interference in the internal affairs of Afghanistan," the USSR Foreign Ministry spokesman said.

"As for references to film," Gennadiy Gerasimov said, "given the existence of modern technology, it is not particularly difficult to fabricate this." It is fairly easy to refute such a falsification. An impartial international commission of experts, which the Soviet Union and Afghanistan propose should be formed, could successfully do this. However, Pakistan rejects this suggestion.

It cannot be ruled out, Gennadiy Gerasimov noted, that this entire episode is nothing more than preparation for fresh and even more serious provocations against Afghanistan.

Fate of WWII Envoy Wallenberg

LD1909154488 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1514 GMT 19 Sep 88

[Text] Moscow, 19 Sep (TASS)—At a briefing today for Soviet and foreign journalists Gennadiy Gerasimov, head of the USSR Foreign Ministry Information Administration, spoke about the fate of Swedish diplomat Raoul Wallenberg.

During the war Raoul Wallenberg saved more than 20,000 Hungarian Jews from annihilation by the Hitlerites, the USSR Foreign Ministry spokesman said. In January 1945 Wallenberg was arrested in Budapest in an area of combat operations by Soviet troops. Inquiries about his fate after that have been received on many occasions by the Soviet authorities.

In 1957 during routine searches through the archive documents of the sanitary services of the Lubyanka Prison a hand-written report addressed to the then Minister of State Security Abakumov was discovered, signed by the head of the service, Smoltsov. The document said that "the prisoner Wallenberg died suddenly in his cell last night, it is presumed of a myocardiac infarct." In the report Smoltsov asks for instructions regarding who should be entrusted with carrying out an autopsy. Further on in the report is a note in Smoltsov's hand: "Have reported personally to the minister. Order to cremate the body without an autopsy. 17 July, 1947."

Smoltsov died in 1953. Abakumov, former minister of state security, who acted in violation of the laws of the USSR was condemned and shot on a verdict of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

Gennadiy Gerasimov recalled that the Soviet Government of the day expressed its sincere regret as to what had happened and conveyed deep condolences to the Swedish Government and Wallenberg's relatives.

On Friday [16 September] at a plenary session of the Vienna meeting of the CSCE of representatives of the United States, Canada, Great Britain, Sweden, Switzerland, and Hungary, speeches were made about the so-called "Wallenberg case." The Hungarian representative referred to Wallenberg's great services in saving human lives.

CW Ban Treaty Verifiable

LD1909164188 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1548 GMT 19 Sep 88

[Text] Moscow, 19 Sep (TASS)—Gennadiy Gerasimov, head of the information department of the USSR Foreign Ministry, today commented on references that have appeared in the newspapers of West European countries to the claim made by Max Kampelman, head of the U.S. delegation at the Geneva talks on nuclear and space weapons, that there is a poor outlook for the conclusion of an international convention outlawing chemical weapons. In particular, the U.S. expert unexpectedly claimed that such an agreement is unsuitable for inspection.

In this connection, the USSR Foreign Ministry spokesman noted that a broad system for international verification of a future convention outlawing and eliminating chemical weapons has been drawn up and largely agreed on at the Geneva talks. He recalled that this verification system includes systematic inspections of the destruction of stockpiles of such weaponry and of facilities for its production. It envisages measures for verifying that chemical weapons are not produced commercially, and for on-site inspections on demand, which extend beyond the bounds of the chemical industry.

No one at the Geneva talks objected to verification, including the U.S. representatives. As for the United States, Gennadiy Gerasimov stressed, the U.S. delegation did not favor its being stepped up, but softened, attempting to limit the sphere of international monitoring of nonproduction of chemical weapons in commercial industry.

"Arguments about the impossibility of verifying a chemical weapons' ban cannot stand up to criticism," Gennadiy Gerasimov said, recalling a speech by Vice President George Bush on 18 April 1984 at the UN disarmament conference, when he spoke in favor of a zero option on chemical weapons with the utmost in-depth inspections.

"The reluctance of the U.S. side to abandon its chemical arsenals, taking into account supplementing of them with new types of chemical weapons, binary weapons, can only cause grave concern on our part," Gennadiy Gerasimov said.

More on Gerasimov 15 Sep News Conference

PM1909102188 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 17 Sep 88 First Edition p 5

[TASS report: "At USSR Foreign Ministry Press Center"]

[Text] The 15 September briefing for Soviet and foreign journalists at the USSR Foreign Ministry press center began unusually. Correspondents were shown an interview given to Soviet television by Afghan Defense Minister Shahnawaz Tanay. In the interview the minister noted that since the withdrawal of half the Soviet military contingent in accordance with the Geneva agreements, the terrorist activity of extremist groupings, especially in the border provinces, has been stepped up. But the Afghan Armed Forces' combat morale and training have now increased considerably, Shahnawaz Tanay continued. They can repel any intrigues by the forces trying to resolve the Afghan problem by armed means.

Touching on the fulfillment of the Geneva accords, the defense minister stressed that the USSR and Afghanistan are fulfilling them in full. But, he said, Pakistan has unfortunately failed to take a single positive step toward implementing the Geneva accords. Quite the opposite, the activity of Pakistan and the United States in training, equipping, arming, and dispatching caravans of weapons and ammunition and forming the armed counterrevolution in Afghanistan has increased several times over.

The minister reported that 440 instances of Pakistan's violation of the Geneva agreements have already been recorded and the UN observation commission has been

presented with 78 notes on the subject. It is for this reason that the Pakistani authorities are disseminating phony propaganda claims that Afghan aircraft have bombed Pakistani territory.

G.I. Gerasimov, chief of the USSR Foreign Ministry Information Department, who held the briefing, reported that in connection with the complex situation which has taken shape in Burma a number of countries—the United States, China, Japan, Britain, and Australia—have carried out a partial evacuation of the members of the families of staff members at diplomatic missions in Rangoon. We have also decided to evacuate from Rangoon the members of the families of the employees of the embassy and other Soviet institutions in Burma.

The USSR Foreign Ministry spokesman stated that the Soviet Union treats with understanding the Burmese people's desire for democratization and the solution of urgent political and socioeconomic problems and it hopes that the national forces will be able to reach a settlement of the situation and achieve nationwide consensus by peaceful means.

Commenting on the recent speech by Y. 'Arafat, chairman of the PLO Executive Committee, in the European Parliament, G.I. Gerasimov stressed that this is evidence of the realistic, constructive course of the PLO leadership, which confirms its sincere desire for a fair settlement of the problem with a consideration for the interests of all sides.

More on Gerasimov 14 Sep News Conference

PM2009085988 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 16 Sep 88 First Edition p 3

[TASS report: "At the USSR Foreign Ministry Press Center"]

[Excerpt] Rare are the briefings in Moscow where the subject of a settlement of the situation around Afghanistan is not raised. This was the case at a meeting with journalists 14 September, when G.I. Gerasimov, chief of the USSR Foreign Ministry Information Administration, commented on a recent statement on Pakistani television. It claimed that this country's aircraft had a dogfight with Afghan aircraft last Monday and shot down two of them. The USSR Foreign Ministry spokesman said that, according to Soviet data, Afghan aircraft had not violated Pakistan's territory and, so, there had been no dogfight there. All this "information" had been needed so as to accuse Afghanistan of violating Pakistani sovereignty.

G.I. Gerasimov dwelt on the decision of U.S. Defense Secretary F. Carlucci who, according to press reports, gave the order to embark on the development of a new type of nuclear missile with penetrating warheads. They are specially designed to destroy underground facilities. The development of such attack systems, the USSR Foreign Ministry spokesman stressed, can be pursuing only one goal—the creation of a first-strike potential—because this weapon is designed to strike command posts and ballistic missile launch silos. [passage omitted]

43d UN General Assembly Agenda: 'Intense Work'

LD1909092688 Moscow TASS in English 0859 GMT 19 Sep 88

[Text] New York September 19 TASS— TASS correspondents Vladimir Matyash and Vyacheslav Chernyshev report:

The problems of curbing the arms race, the nuclear arms race, in the first place, the prevention of its spread to outer space, the ensurance of human rights, the resolution of regional conflicts, eradication of the policy of apartheid, and the establishment of a comprehensive system of international security occupy the central place on the agenda of the 43rd session of the United Nations General Assembly which opens here on September 20.

There are more than 140 items on the session's agenda. Three months of intense work lie ahead. Much is to be done within the period to consolidate all positive changes which have already been achieved in the international arena due to the persistent efforts of the Soviet Union, other socialist countries, and the entire peace-loving mankind. It is precisely this task that the peoples of the world assign to the UNO now.

The United Nations Organisation which now brings together 159 countries is the mirror of the changing world. In this sense each session has its own peculiarities. The 43rd session is no exception in this respect either. It gathers in an atmosphere when positive trends develop in the world under the impact of the new political thinking. A direct threat of a war involving big powers has been reduced.

The Soviet-U.S. meeting in Moscow has shown that the political dialogue between the two countries, within the framework of which the historic INF Treaty was agreed upon and entered into force, is intensifying on the basis of realism and responsibility. Prospects for reductions in conventional arms and the armed forces in Europe for limitation and termination of nuclear tests and the elimination of chemical weapons become more realistic.

It is pointed out in U.N. circles that the Geneva accords on Afghanistan have become a good example of how political will can bring any complex conflict to the road of a peaceful political settlement.

Mikhail Gorbachev's speech in Krasnoyarsk, in which it was pointed out that the UNO was again gathering strength and that its role was growing, has been regarded with much interest at the United Nations. Attention is also paid to the fact that the Soviet leader expressed the USSR's readiness to do everything to maintain the prestige and to enhance the role of the world body. This

important idea is consonant with the thesis of the report on the work of the organisation, submitted to the delegates by U.N. Secretary-General Javier Perez de Cuellar who stated that jointly to solve a multitude of global problems reflecting the community of U.N. member-nations is quite a practicable idea, and that nuclear war cannot be won and should never be fought.

The delegates to the session will devote much attention to the consideration of the concept of a comprehensive system of international peace and security.

"The establishment of such a system within the U.N. framework and on the basis of the U.N. charter would ensure a guaranteed survival and prosperity of mankind", Vladimir Petrovskiy, deputy minister of foreign affairs of the USSR, said in an interview with the TASS correspondents on the eve of the session.

"The main road to forming it runs through disarmament. The Soviet-U.S. INF Treaty, which marked the beginning of a real nuclear disarmament, has become a genuine breakthrough in this respect. Along with disarmament, a settlement of regional conflicts is the subject of particular concern of multilateral diplomacy within the U.N. framework. Headway towards an improvement of the situation manifested itself in this field of late, and propects opened up for resolving the years-long conflict situations concerning Afghanistan, the Persian Gulf, South East Asia, the south of Africa, the Western Sahara, and Cyprus".

"There is growing awareness of the need for a Middle East settlement through the convocation of an international conference under U.N. auspices. The Soviet Union has come to the session with an intention to promote further intensification of the processes of renewal of world politics through concrete deed and through the instrumentality of the UNO. Among almost 150 items on the session's agenda, there is not a single one on which the Soviet Union would not be ready to seek solutions acceptable to everyone".

Soviet Priorities for Session

LD1909181888 Moscow TASS in English 1502 GMT 19 Sep 88

[Text] Moscow September 19 TASS—By TASS diplomatic correspondent:

The 43rd session of the U.N. General Assembly, due to open on September 20, is to be held at a time when the world community plays an increasingly more active role as a really functioning centre for improving the international situation. Settlement of the Afghan problem, cessation of hostilities in the Iran-Iraq front—the way out of these protracted bloody conflicts has been found not only owing to the striving for compromise, displayed by the parties to conflicts, and also, above all, owing to energetic efforts of the United Nations which helped elaborate mutually-acceptable decisions. New successful approaches, which enabled to have the Afghan and the Iran-Iraq conflicts unlocked, are expected to promote settlement of crisis situations in other regions.

On the eve of the session the Soviet Union is demonstrating the intention to promote within the U.N. framework through concrete deeds a further deepening of the processes of renewal of world politics. The USSR is guided by the concept of establishing a comprehensive system of peace and security, which was approved in the General Assembly's Resolution 42/93 last year.

Proceeding from the results of the dialogue, held at the United Nations in the previous years, on questions of establishing a system of comprehensive security, the Soviet Union deems it necessary for the session to concentrate attention on three problems: priority of international law in world politics, enhancing of the role of the U.N. basic agencies and U.N. peace-keeping activities.

The Soviet side does not propose beforehand any draft resolutions, inviting all participants in the discussion for a joint quest for consensus decisions. To have the disarmament process accelerated it would be exclusively important for the forthcoming session to back up the bilateral efforts of the USSR and the USA with multilateral efforts in that sphere.

Priority attention should be paid to questions of ecology and preservation of the environment. Believing that solution of many problems, amassed in that sphere, brooks no delay, the Soviet Union proposes that an international conference on environmental protection, planned for 1992, be held earlier. The Soviet side is ready for immediate consultations on that score, said in that connection Deputy Foreign Minister of the USSR Vladimir Petrovskiy.

For the United Nations to function efficiently it is necessary for one to overcome the customary stereotypes, and for the political leaders to become aware that there is no prospect in imposing somebody's will on others, and that it is necesary to have greater security.

U.S. Departing From 'Negativism'

PM2009074988 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 18 Sep 88 Second Edition p 5

[Own correspondents V. Linnik and V. Sukhoy dispatch: "Peace Is a Common Concern. Prior to the Opening of the 43d UN General Assembly Session"]

[Excerpts] "The UN founder states proceeded on the premise that the United Nations and nongovernmental organizations have a common task—the implementation of the ideas enshrined in the UN charter. Our cooperation is developing successfully and must develop in the future." These words were spoken by UN Secretary General J. Perez de Cuellar on the opening day of the

conference of nongovernmental organizations, held annually by the UN Department of Public Information. This year the conference theme was very topical—"The Role of the United Nations in Settling Conflicts and Maintaining Peace and Global Security." [passage omitted]

Listening to the speeches made by the UN secretary general and other participants in the conference, we involuntarily thought how gratifying it is that official diplomacy has finally abandoned the condescending attitude that characterized it for so many years toward the public's foreign policy efforts and toward what is now described as "people's diplomacy." At the same time it is precisely the "voice of the people" that has often been heard before the voices of professional politicians and diplomats—for instance, on such questions as ecology, the banning of nuclear weapons tests, and the freezing of nucelar arsenals. [passage omitted]

It looks as though the United States has begun little by little to abandon its customary negativism toward the United Nations. Domestic U.S. debates on how to behave at the United Nations have also, incidentally, affected the current presidential campaign. Vice President Bush has frequently accused his opponent M. Dukakis of wanting to leave U.S. foreign policy to UN discretion. At the same time even the Republicans' spiritual mentor—R. Reagan—has "had a change of heart" and announced the U.S. Government's decision to begin paying its debts to the United Nations. But the debt that has accumulated is no laughing matter—approximately $0.5 billion. Thus changes are taking place.

The Soviet Union is going to this session with a concept which may be briefly expounded in the following theses. First, we are proceeding on the basis of the need to assert the primacy of international law in contemporary interstate relations. Second, we advocate boosting the role of the United Nations both on disarmament questions and also on the settlement of regional conflicts and in resolving such a burning problem as ecology. Third, the USSR advocates galvanizing UN peacekeeping forces. The originality of our approach also consists in the fact that we are the first since 1945 not to bring with us prepared draft resolutions on these questions, since we expect that such drafts will take shape after all members of the world community have expressed an opinion on them.

Europarliament Reviews Report on Soviet Ties

LD1409232288 Moscow TASS in English 2253 GMT 14 Sep 88

[Text] Strasbourg, France, September 15 TASS—By TASS special correspondent Aleksandr Sorokin:

The European Parliament, at a session under way here, discussed on Wednesday a report on political relations between the European communities and the Soviet Union.

The report was delivered, on behalf of the Europarliament's Political Commission, by Klaus Haensch, deputy from the West German Free Democratic Party.

Normalisation of relations between the Soviet Union, which plays a big role in Europe and the world as a whole, and the European communities meets the interests of both sides, the report said.

At present, conditions have been created for their successful development. In particular, the international climate has markedly changed.

The report said the Soviet policy of new thinking, which underlies the perestroyka drive, opened ways toward better mutual understanding.

The report was keynoted by an idea that a nuclear conflict in Europe would see neither winners nor losers but would doom European civilisation to full annihilation.

Moreover, even a conventional war would lead to uncontrolled and unpredictable consequences due to the presence in Europe of a big number of nuclear reactors, chemical plants and other potentially dangerous facilities.

No European state can now use weapons without thus dooming itself to annihilation. This makes efforts to control and cut deadly arsenals, accumulated in Europe, the main task of the security policy.

Ideological differences in the nuclear age can no longer determine one's foreign policies.

Security in Europe is a goal that can be achieved only through joint efforts rather than by confrontation.

The report analysed processes taking place in all fields of life in the Soviet Union and expressed its full support for them.

It considered prospects for cooperation between the Soviet Union and the communities in environmental protection, in efforts to ensure safety of peaceful uses of nuclear energy, in scientific research, and relations with developing countries.

Soviet Delegation Leader Assesses Vienna Talks

LD1609191588 Moscow TASS in English 1846 GMT 16 Sep 88

[Text] Moscow September 16 TASS—Perestroyka in the Soviet Union with its dynamic process of democratisation and glasnost has had a favourable effect on international relations, which could not but tell on the work of the Vienna meeting, said Yuriy Kashlev, the leader of the USSR delegation at the Vienna meeting. An interview taken from him is published in tonight's issue of IZVESTIYA newspaper. On the other hand, the Soviet diplomat emphasized, the U.S. negative position on a

number of issues manifests itself.CSCE follow-up meetings are notable for at least three peculiarities. Firstly, for their participants: They are attended by 33 European countries as well as by the United States and Canada. Secondly, for their agenda. Unlike all other talks which usually deal with definite subjects, under discussion in Vienna is the entire range of problems connected with relations betwen these countries—the unity and interrelationship of military, political, economic, scientific, ecological and humanitarian issues. The third peculiarity is the rule of consensus. Any decision may be taken only by common agreement of opinion.

Yuriy Kashlev emphasizes that there was a time when the Soviet side attached paramount importance to military issues. "This went on until we came to realize that human rights and humanitarian issues are as important as military and political ones," the leader of the Soviet delegation said. "And somewhat belatedly we began to treat them with a no lesser attention than the other side."

"If there is some snag in democratisation and glasnost inside our country, this finds immediate reaction abroad and is also felt during our negotiations," Yuriy Kashlev maintains. "Of course, there is no denying that we have achieved a real breakthrough in the field of humanitarian and human rights issues as compared with the past. And still there is no such a sharp turn in that field as has been made in the military field where we agred on immense historic matters. I mean, first of all, the beginning of the elimination of Soviet and American intermediate- and shorter-range missiles and strategic arms reduction talks. So, very much is yet to be done."

Yuriy Kashlev informs the readers of the newspapers that two large-scale meetings are to be held within the framework of the Vienna meeting in the military and political field: Twenty-three member countries of Warsaw-Treaty and North Atlantic Treaty Organisations, and of all 35 countries participating in the CSCE process. Within the framework of the second 'basket' an economic forum is to be held in Czechoslovakia, an economic conference in the Federal Republic of Germany on trade and cooperation, a scientific forum in Italy, and an ecological one in Bulgaria or Switzerland.

Besides, there will be a conference on human dimensions as well as several annual meetings on this question, an information forum in London and a symposium on European heritage in Krakow. This is a wide-ranging agenda which makes it possible to draw the conclusion that the 'walls of a common European home can already be discerned.'

Historians Mark Munich Agreement Anniversary

LD1909150988 Moscow TASS in English 1427 GMT 19 Sep 88

[Text] Moscow September 19 TASS—Were it not for the treacherous Munich Agreement which was concluded between Germany, France, and Britian on September 29, 1938, and which opened the way to fascist occupation of Czechoslovakia, the republic would have been able to defend itself from the invasion of Nazi troops. This conclusion has been drawn by Soviet historians on the strength of documents published recently.

Today they attended a news conference organized by the NOVOSTI PRESS AGENCY and dedicated to the 50th anniversary of the signing of the Munich Agreement.

In the 1930s Czechoslovakia had one of Europe's strongest armies which numerically was almost up to the Nazi one, Aleksandr Orlov, a departmental chief at the Institute of Military History, told journalists. The quality of military hardwear and armaments of the Czechoslovak Army was rather high. There were strong fortifications on the border with Germany.

Suffice it to say, Aleksandr Orlov emphasized, that on September 27 a group of high-ranking German generals sent a memorandum to the Imperial Chancellery, pointing out that Germany was not prepared for war and had greater armament deficiencies. Even in case of complete mobilisation of the Army it would lack 48,000 officers. On the other hand, the document said, Czechoslovak Army would be able to hold out independently for three-four months irrespective of whether assistance is rendered to Czechoslovakia or not.

The Soviet Union was ready to come to the aid of Czechoslovakia: large forces were concentrated on the USSR's western border.

But one should not forget another peculiarity of the "Munich deal"—the agreement was aimed at uniting the capitalist countries of Europe against the USSR, remarked Lev Bezymenskiy, a Soviet historian and journalist. New documents indicate that even after Germany violated the pact by occupying Prague in 1939, the Berlin-London contacts directed against the Soviet Union did not cease. In particular, in 1939 Hermann Goering through influential British industrialists put forward the idea of a 'second Munich'. The idea was picked up by London and virtually undermined the possibility of concluding an agreement between the USSR, Britain and France, the possibility which was being discussed in Moscow at that time.

In answer to journalists' questions, Aleksandr Chubaryan, director of the Institute of World History of the USSR Academy of Sciences, said it was planned to publish new documents pertaining to the pre-war history of Europe. Specifically, a collection of documents pertaining to the entire year 1939 has already been prepared in the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs. It will be published soon.

United States & Canada

Tbilisi Forum Discusses U.S.-Soviet Ties

LD2009022088 Moscow TASS in English 2356 GMT 19 Sep 88

[Text] Tbilisi September 20 TASS—The participants in the 4th conference of the Soviet and American public, devoted to Soviet-American relations, held a plenary meeting yesterday morning. It was opened by Anatoliy Adamishin, USSR deputy foreign minister, and Thomas Simons, US deputy under secretary of state.

The forum organised by the Chautauqua Institute in the United States and the Union of Soviet Societies for Friendship and Cultural Ties With Foreign Countries drew 500 Soviet and American experts in various fields and more than 5,000 public representatives of Georgia, a Soviet Transcaucasian republic.

Anatoliy Adamishin said that the level of Soviet-American relations and the involvement of dozens of thousands of citizens of both countries into the dialogue speaks about the unprecedented scope of multilateral contacts.

"It is not only the figures which, of course, are very impressive. The quantity is turning into quality changing the character of our relations." Adamishin highlighted the role of people in both countries in advancing them towards new relations and solid reconciliation.

One of the signs of our time is that international relations are becoming more and more the relations among people and not only countries. Dialogue, realism and continuity are the factors which determine the future of Soviet-American relations.

On the whole, Thomas Simons, member of the State Department, shared the opinion of his Soviet colleague that contacts between the superpowers had reached their peak in the entire postwar history.

Having emphasized that the approach of both countries was based on some common interests and values, he said that new points of contact should be found. However, Simons believes that dialogue with the Soviet Union should be supported by the policy of force.

Touching upon human rights and principles of their protection Simons resorted to old rhetoric. It is noteworthy that asked by the fellow-countryman why the United States was not joining international human rights agreements, Simons did not give any definite answer and referred to differences in the legislation of American states.

Adamishin, U.S. Official Cited

LD1909231588 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 19 Sep 88

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Our special correspondent, Vladimir Pozner, reports from the Georgian capital:

[Pozner] The first working sessions of the fourth meeting of citizens of the USSR and the United States took place today in Tbilisi. The state of Soviet-U.S. relations since the summit meetings in Washington and Moscow was discussed at the morning plenary session, which took place in the main hall of the philharmonic building in the presence of approximately 2,000 people. The Soviet delegation was represented by USSR Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs Anatoliy Adamishin.

[Begin Adamishin recording] The fact that international relations are increasingly becoming relations truly between peoples and not just between states is a general sign of the times. But this is particularly important for our relations, and the deeper the level of public support for their development, the greater the chances for positive changes to become long-term ones. [end recording]

[Pozner] U.S. Deputy Assistant Secretary of State Simons stated that the principle of conducting talks from a position of strength remained an immutable one for the United States, but he considered it essential at the same time to explain his position.

[Begin Simons recording in English with superimposed Russian translation] I confess that for the Soviet leaders the phrase, talks from a position of strength, sounds suspicious and, probably, similar to diktat—the imposition of unilateral decisions through force. But we understand it differently. To us strength means a return to fundamental U.S. values, ensuring the ability and the will to defend and to develop the interests which are based on those values, while acting with magnanimity, confidence, and purposefulness. [end recording]

[Pozner] Two discussions also took place today. In the first, in the House of the Cinema, regional conflicts were considered—one of the most acute questions of Soviet-U.S. relations. Speaking on the U.S. side were: Richard Holmes and A. Michael Mandelbaum; and on the Soviet side—Academician Yevgeniy Primakov. Representatives of the public took an active part in the discussion. This also applies to the second discussion on how we see each other. Mellor Sturua, Aleksandr Bovin, Hedrick Smith, and Gregory Gurov expressed their views about this. The discussions continue tomorrow.

Roundtable Held on Soviet-U.S. Relations

LD1709105688 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1917 GMT 15 Sep 88

["Roundtable" discussion moderated by commentator Yuriy Rostov, with Academician Gyorgiy Arbatov; Valentin Falin, chairman of the board of NOVOSTI; writer Fedor Burlatskiy; Vitaliy Zhurkin, director of the Europe Institute; Arthur Cox, secretary of the U.S. Committee on Soviet-American Relations; Townsend Hoopes, former deputy secretary of the Department of the Air Force; and Genrikh Trofimenko, head of a department at the USA and Canada Institute—American participants speak in English with superimposed Russian translation]

[Text] [Announcer] Dear comrades, we now have a roundtable discussion for you. A joint Soviet-U.S. research project on the issue of guaranteeing stable coexistence between the USSR and the United States has been completed. Participating in this project, the first of its kind in the history of the two countries, were, on the Soviet side, Academician Arbatov, Valentin Falin, chairman of the board of NOVOSTI, writer Fedor Burlatskiy, and Vitaliy Zhurkin, director of the Europe Institute. The American specialists included former high-ranking employee of the State Department and the CIA Arthur Cox, former Under Secretary of State George Ball, and former Director of the CIA William Colby. Our correspondent met with the participants in the project.

[Begin recording] [Rostov] Three years ago our country's USA and Canada Institute, a leading institution for the study of the United States of America, and the U.S. Committee on Soviet-American relations, a private organization in the United States, decided to conduct a joint research project into problems of relations between the United States and the Soviet Union. They were to find how to improve these relations and how to put an end to the cold war period. Now the results of the research project have been summed up. The directors of the project were Georgiy Arbatov, on the Soviet side, and Arthur Cox, secretary of the U.S. Committee on Soviet-American Relations, formerly a high-ranking employee of the State Department and the CIA, on the American side. Also taking part in our meeting today are Townsend Hoopes, former U.S. deputy secretary of the Department of the Air Force, and Genrikh Trofimenko, head of a department at the USA and Canada Institute.

My first question: It was said that the greatest number of differences in the course of work arose over the history of Soviet-U.S. relations.

[Arbatov] Indeed, that was so. It turned out that the most difficult subject to reach agreement on was history. But whenever we approached the present time, and especially the elucidation of what has to be done, it became much easier to reach agreement. I think this is a good thing. Perhaps for a time we should not go into history all that much but instead think about ways of solving the problems. This will be of assistance, in any event.

[Cox] I agree with Academician Arbatov's view and also think that we should focus our attention on the conclusions we have reached as the result of our joint work.

[Rostov] What conclusion and what initiatives do you consider to be worthy of attention?

[Cox] Our main conclusion is that in order to put an end to the cold war, Soviet-U.S. relations should be demilitarized. We are in agreement with General Secretary Gorbachev's idea that rivalry between our countries can continue in the political, economic, and ideological fields. But the application of military force should be totally excluded from Soviet-U.S. relations.

[Hoopes] I would like to emphasize that this point of view is finding ever-increasing understanding in the United States. People are becoming aware that it is senseless to accumulate weapons and that we should seek out ways of solving the problems between us in a more sensible way.

[Arbatov] The crux of the matter is how to do away with the cold war as quickly as possible and begin the implementation of consistent demilitarization of Soviet-U.S. relations. The specific methods comprise a whole number of disarmament proposals, including going over to the idea of sensible sufficiency, reducing conventional weapons, reducing nuclear weapons, ending nuclear tests, strict observance of the ABM Treaty—on antimissile defense—destruction of chemical weapons, and so on; and a part on regional conflicts—giving up the use of military force, limiting trade in the most advanced and dangerous weapons, limiting the number of military advisers and instructors, by agreement, to small numbers in third countries, primarily in Third World countries, limiting weapons deliveries to what is essential for defense, and finally establishing a joint center for the exchange of even intelligence material on any growing serious threats in various hot spots of the world. The conclusion is very important, that is, reaching a firm agreement that all regional conflicts should be settled through international organizations, on the basis of international law, and above all through the United Nations Organization. It seems to me that all these are proposals which reflect today's requirements and I see no reason why they should not be acceptable.

[Trofimenko] Although there were many differences, it was nevertheless clear that despite the whole confrontation, so to speak, the Soviet Union and the United States do not, first of all, do not have any inherent antagonism in their national interests—in fact, the interests of the two countries do not clash. Second, despite the cold war, both countries continued to proceed toward an ever

increasing mutual understanding, although there was much that hampered this, (?old) stereotypes and so on, that had piled up. These have to be cleared away.

[Rostov] The work went on for 3 years. During that time much has changed in Soviet-U.S. relations. How did the changed situation affect your conclusions?

[Arbatov] You know, I think that the changed situation helped us a great deal, all in all. I think that the changes that have taken place, first and foremost in the political thinking of the Soviet leadership and in the policies of the Soviet Union, helped us to feel our way. Three and a half years ago I would have found some of the things contained in the report unacceptable, impossible, but now I agree with them.

[Rostov] What things are these?

[Arbatov] Our proposals include, for example, a proposal to move to a nonviolent world, a proposal for both the Soviet Union and the United States to exclude the use of military force in regional conflicts. Earlier I would have been disturbed by it. Now it doesn't disturb me. Disarmament proposals—that we should also use the method of asymmetric reductions, and many of the other proposals, on nuclear disarmament and on significant reductions in nuclear and conventional weapons, became a reality just recently.

[Cox] We agree with Academician Arbatov's view on the importance of new political thinking in the Soviet Union. It influenced not only the Soviet participants in the project but also the U.S. side. I doubt if the conclusions that we have arrived at, the recommendations we have made, would have been so unanimous without the new political thinking.

[Hoopes] In the course of work on the project we did more than learn from one another. It is important that together we were able to propose to our governments realistic and practical measures for improving Soviet-U.S. relations.

[Rostov] How do you intend to convey the results of your work to the governments?

[Arbatov] On the Soviet side we had not sought any coordination with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs or other government departments. But I am deeply convinced that all the proposals that have been adopted are not going to be unacceptable to Soviet policies. The full text of the report will be submitted to all foreign policy departments and, apart from that, we are going to publish it in one of our political magazines, either in the MEZHDUNARODNAYA ZHIZN magazine or in the SSHA: EKONOMIKA, POLITIKA, IDEOLOGIA magazine. This question is being decided right now.

[Cox] We in the United States have done quite a lot to make the public aware of our report. In particular, we submitted this document to Congress, where the leaders of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee familiarized themselves with it, and we published it in the congressional bulletin. In the next few months we are planning to familiarize the presidential candidates—George Bush and Michael Dukakis—with the report. After the elections we intend to familiarize the closest advisers and employees of the newly elected president with the report. Our organization, the U.S. Committee on U.S.-Soviet Relations, is one of the leading organizations in the field of international relations in the United States. It is going to make use of all its capabilities and resources to familiarize the U.S. public with the conclusions and recommendations presented in the report.

[Rostov] Thank you very much. [end recording]

IZVESTIYA on Carlucci Visit to PRC

PM1909090188 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 16 Sep 88 Morning Edition p 4

[Own correspondent Yu. Savenkov dispatch: "What Did Carlucci's Visit Show?"]

[Text] Beijing—The visit by U.S. Secretary of Defense Frank Carlucci to China, which ended last week, cannot be described as sensational. Regular contacts between Chinese and U.S. figures at various levels became commonplace following the normalization of diplomatic relations between the two countries in the late seventies. Judging by Carlucci's statement, this practice will continue regardless of the outcome of the upcoming presidential elections in Washington.

Even though the U.S. guest's visit was given modest coverage by the Chinese press, his meetings were at quite a high level. He had conversations with Deng Xiaoping, chairman of the PRC Central Military Commission; Li Peng, premier of the PRC State Council; his deputy Wu Xueqian; and of course Defense Minister Qin Jiwei. The Cambodian settlement was one of the regional problems discussed. Carlucci and China's defense minister emphasized the importance of the withdrawal of Vietnamese troops and the solution of the problem by Cambodians themselves. The U.S. side spoke in favor of direct talks between Sihanouk and Vietnam. China affirmed its support for a "coalition government" with participation by the four sides headed by Sihanouk. This was also mentioned by Carlucci at a news conference, who noted that no single grouping, especially the "Khmer Rouge," should be allowed to dominate.

In the course of the conversations, the sides also gave attention to the state of Soviet-U.S. and Soviet-Chinese relations. It must be noted that the U.S. secretary of defense no longer voiced the U.S. theses, so widespread

in the past, about "containing" the Soviet Union in the Asia-Pacific region and the "parallel strategic interests" of the PRC and the United States in "hot spots" in the Asian Continent.

There was a detailed discussion during Carlucci's visit of the question of "Silkworm" missiles, which, according to U.S. claims, China sold to Iran and in the Near East, supposedly destabilizing the situation there, and the question of restrictions on the transmission of technology to China introduced by the U.S. Congress and Administration.

There is another problem. China has entered the international market for space services, having set up a corporation to offer rockets for satellite launches to other countries. The head of the U.S. military department declared that "agreement in principle to use Chinese rockets to launch U.S. satellites" was reached during his visit to Beijing. "The President has already decided to notify Congress that we will let the Chinese launch three satellites," Carlucci said.

Paper Rebuts USIA Disinformation Allegations

PM1909084188 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
16 Sep 88 Morning Edition p 4

[D. Sergeyev "Rejoinder": "Who Is Misinforming?"]

[Text] The USIA—the U.S. Information Agency—has recently been making strong complaints that the Soviet press is waging a misinformation campaign against the United States. This, it claims, is an attempt "to discredit the United States in the eyes of the whole world." We are actually talking about a stream of complaints about the "perfidy" of Soviet propaganda appearing even in the U.S. newspapers.

It is claimed, for example, that none other but the Soviet Union is to blame for the spread of news reports linking the appearance of the AIDS virus with U.S. development work in the sphere of biological weapons. The USIA can certainly continue to insist on its story. But here is what known facts prove:

U.S. Congressman Theodore Weiss—by no means a paid Soviet misinformation agent—was the first to raise the question of probable links between AIDS and military research. He raised it at a medical symposium on AIDS problems held at the Lenox Hill Hospital—by no means a Soviet medical institution. He raised this question in April 1983—in other words, long before the Soviet press first reported it. T. Weiss called in his speech at the time for an investigation into whether biological weapons had been used against homosexuals, bearing in mind the negative attitude of some strata of U.S. society toward them. We do not know the considerations which prompted him or the information on which he relied. Something else is important here: The Soviet Union had nothing to do with it.

Still back in 1983 but in the summer, Charlie Sheyveli (an American) published in the newspaper GAY COMMUNITY NEWS an (American) article which developed the following thesis: The epidemic in the United States was caused by an African swine flu virus produced in a CIA military laboratory in Fort Gulick, in the Panama Canal zone, in the course of development of biological weapons. This virus was transported first to the U.S.-controlled island of Navassa near Haiti, and later to the Guantanamo base where it was used to damage Cuba's agriculture. The aforementioned hypothesis was based on an article by Harvard pathobiologist Jane Teaz (also an American) in the journal LANCET (also American) published in April of that year under the title "Could the AIDS Virus Have Been Caused by a New Strain of African Swine Flu?"

By way of a further example, one could cite Dennis Altman's book "AIDS in the Mind of America," which analyzes this story in detail and reports that, back in 1984, the U.S. Department of Agriculture and the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases had instituted a scientific program to study the possible role played by the African swine flu virus in the emergence of AIDS. Or an article in the newspaper VILLAGE VOICE by Larry Flint, who wrote in November 1983 that AIDS was caused by the chemical compound "Ogda-Ogda" [as published] which was deliberately spread by specialists from the Center for Disease Control in Atlanta in order to cause disease among homosexuals. But it is not a matter of how many facts there are.

As we can see, there are indeed many stories and sufficiently varied as well. But they do have one noteworthy feature in common: They all appeared and were discussed in the U.S. press, in specialized U.S. literature, or at scientific symposiums in the United States 2 years before the first reports of the debates taking place abroad on this subject were published in the Soviet Union.

Here is another example, cited particularly often by the USIA in recent weeks and picked up by THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR. The Soviet Union, they believe, is spreading rumors that "the Americans are exporting babies from Latin America, killing them, and selling their organs for transplants." Moreover, THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR itself admits that these rumors initially started in Honduras, Guatemala, and Paraguay. In other words, in Latin America itself, and none of the aforementioned countries can in any way be classed as belonging to "the Soviet (as people in the West love to say) bloc." Only afterwards did they make their way to the world, including the Soviet, press—and this is also admitted by THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR.

So, after all this, what is to be perceived as misinformation? Could it be the accusations of misinformation leveled against us and so stubbornly repeated by the USIA?

Northeast Asia

Gorbachev 'Concern' for Japan's Defense Budget

OW1909130588 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1200 GMT 18 Sep 88

[Text] CPSU General Secretary Gorbachev made a speech in the Siberian city of Krasnoyarsk in which he touched on Soviet relations with the Asian and Pacific countries. He pointed out that Soviet-Japanese relations are important in all aspects of the situation in this region. In his speech, Gorbachev also said: The USSR appropriately appraises the resumption of Soviet relations with the National Association of Prefectural Governors of Japan and the Japanese business circles' show of interest in the fact that the USSR is reestablishing its position as a major trade and economic partner of Japan. The humanitarian issues and various entrepreneurial problems which remain at present as obstacles to building a relationship of trust will eventually be resolved.

However, it has to be pointed out that the Soviet people, like all other neighboring countries of Japan, are concerned about the stubborn increase of Japanese military expenditures within the so-called framework of burden-sharing with the United States. The 1-percent-of-GNP ceiling of the defense budget looks moderate. But if we take into consideration the fact that this 1 percent grows with Japan's growing economic power, it constitutes a subject of serious concern. Japan is seen to be embracing the concept of attaining major power status in the present world without relying on militarism. However, it is only natural that the following question is posed: Why is it doing things to blemish this unique credibility which serves as a very distinctive example for the whole of mankind? Why is it blemishing the [word indistinct] energy of its economic presence which penetrates every corner of the world by its historical illusion of being confronted with a war or being in a wartime situation?

Such was the gist of Gorbachev's statement on Soviet relations with the Asian and Pacific nations in his speech at Krasnoyarsk.

Media Reaction to Proposals

OW1909140688 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1200 GMT 18 Sep 88

[Text] The Japanese mass media has shown strong interest in the series of concrete proposals made by General Secretary Gorbachev toward further consolidating peace in the Far East. In particular, the Soviet Government's statement that it will not increase the number of any type of nuclear weapons in the Asian and Pacific Region, the invitation to hold a conference of major maritime states, and the proposal to hold an international meeting of the foreign ministers of the PRC, Japan, DPRK, and South Korea on freezing military capabilities and disarmament were appraised as having caused a great international sensation.

As usual, the Japanese Foreign Ministry immediately reacted to Gorbachev's statements. The Foreign Ministry press statement intended for publication in newspapers and magazines, from all indications, sought to lead the way for all other commentators and to impose its own views on the national public opinion. There are not a few people in Japan who hold anti-Soviet sentiments regarding the clearcut peaceful thinking embodied in Gorbachev's speech. Japanese diplomats are put in a very difficult position.

On the other hand, people representing broad sectors of the peace-loving Japanese public have looked at Gorbachev's speech in a more evenhanded manner and have been touched by it. The Democratic Socialist Party leadership pointed out the concreteness of the Soviet approach toward disarmament in Asia and accepted Gorbachev's proposals rather impartially.

Soviet Diplomat Cited on Relations With ROK

LD1809170588 Budapest Domestic Service in Hungarian 1630 GMT 18 Sep 88

[Text] The South Korean head of state has said it is of outstanding significance that interstate relations are being settled between his country and Hungary.

As we know, an agreement recently took effect under which the two countries are to establish permanent representations in one another's capitals. In connection with this, a Soviet diplomat in Tokyo told a Japanese newspaper that every country should determine for itself its diplomatic endeavors. He added that the Soviet Union does not intend to take up interstate relations with South Korea, but he did not exclude the possibility of the reciprocal establishment of commercial bureaus.

South Korean President No Tae-u had discussions in Seoul with Japanese Prime Minister Noburu Takeshita in which he emphasized that he expects relations between the East European countries and South Korea to develop.

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Burma Beam Questions U.S. Plans To Halt Aid

BK2009132288 Moscow in Burmese to Burma 1030 GMT 20 Sep 88

[Station commentary]

[Text] General Saw Maung, leader of the military coup in Burma, announced that the defense forces intend to overcome the political and economic hardships as well as to put an end to the unrest in the country. Today, Burma faces severe shortages of foodstuffs, fuel, basic consumer goods.

The military leadership has banned all demonstrations in order to enforce peace and tranquility and law and order and has ordered all workers and public service

personnel to return to work. But despite such a ban, opposition forces once again tried to stage protests and rallies on Monday [19 September]. This resulted in bloody clashes between the soldiers and the demonstrating people. According to reports coming in from Rangoon, there were casualties on both sides. Eyewitnesses say Rangoon residents went into battle with swords, sticks, bows that shoot sharpened spokes, and other homemade weapons. But the soldiers used weapons to fire on the demonstrators.

Yesterday, a joint statement issued by the opposition leaders called for the struggle for democracy to continue until victory is attained.

It is known by all that the military leaders have already announced that they will be holding multiparty general elections once normalcy and peace return to the country. They also scrapped the laws that enabled the ruling party to control the state power. The opposition leaders in the meantime are forcefully demanding that multiparty general elections be held under a neutral interim government.

Observers in Rangoon point out that the most important thing at the present is to prevent incidents that would make blood flow again. Even though there were violent incidents yesterday, some people still believe that not all the doors have been closed on negotiations between the two conflicting sides.

Experts believe that the future of the country, whoever is leading it, depends greatly on how quickly they can come up with a plan to resolve the socioeconomic problems in Burma. At the same time, it has been pointed out that while the situation remains confusing, foreign countries should avoid acts that would aggravate the political and economic problems in the country. Hence, it is, to say the least, difficult to understand why the United States has announced plans to halt its economic aid to Burma.

More on Visit to Moscow by SRV's Vo Chi Cong

Hanoi Reports Arrival

BK1909153688 Hanoi VNA in English 1500 GMT 19 Sep 88

[Text] Hanoi VNA September 19—Vo Chi Cong, Political Bureau member of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Vietnam and president of the State Council, arrived in Moscow this morning, beginning his official friendship visit to the Soviet Union.

The visit is made at the invitation of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR.

He was greeted at the airport by Andrey Gromyko, Political Bureau member of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet; and other high-ranking party and state officials.

Also present at the welcoming ceremony were Vietnamese Ambassador Nguyen Manh Cam, Lao Ambassador Khamphong Phan Vongsa, and Kampuchean Ambassador Hor Nam Hong.

President Vo Chi Cong and Chairman A. Gromyko reviewed a guard of honour and drove to the reception villa in the Kremlin along the avenue decked up with slogans praising the unshakable Vietnamese-Soviet friendship.

Holds Talks With Gromyko

LD1909163988 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1528 GMT 19 Sep 88

[Text] Moscow, 19 September (TASS)—Talks began in the Kremlin today between Andrey Gromyko, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, and chairman of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, and Vo Chi Cong, member of the Politburo of the Vietnamese Communist Party Central Committee and president of the SRV State Council.

Welcoming Vo Chi Cong, who is making his first official visit to the USSR in his capacity as president of the SRV State Council, Andrey Gromyko expressed his conviction that this visit will help to further deepen fraternal ties and all-around cooperation between the Soviet and Vietnamese peoples and between the CPSU and Vietnamese Communist Party [CPV].

The president of the SRV State Council conveyed cordial greetings from Nguyen Van Linh, general secretary of the CPV Central Committee, and other members of the SRV Central Committee Politburo, and said he was extremely pleased to visit the Soviet Union at a time when the CPSU and the Soviet people are implementing their course of restructuring, the course of the 27th party congress and the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference.

He spoke in detail about the course of implementing the decisions of the Sixth CPV Congress, which mapped out means renewing various spheres of the economy and society and about the achievements and difficulties in doing so. Information was set out on the practical steps being taken in the SRV to deal with the tasks that face the country in improving the organization and style of work of the state apparatus, developing socialist democracy, and strengthening discipline.

On behalf of the CPV and SRV leadership and the entire Vietnamese people, Vo Chi Cong expressed profound gratitude to the CPSU and the working people of the Soviet Union for the great help and support they show Vietnam.

Vo Chi Cong welcomed the new large-scale Soviet initiatives contained in Mikhail Gorbachev's speech in Krasnoyarsk. These initiatives are an important step in

developing the Vladivostok proposals and a valuable contribution to the cause of constructive cooperation with states of the Asian-Pacific region.

The Vietnamese guest demonstrated the SRV's approach to a number of international problems. His country's foreign policy consists of striving to attain a strengthening of international peace and security and confirming peace-loving ideas in international affairs that answer today's requirements.

Andrey Gromyko noted that the interesting and substantive report from the elevated guest enrich Soviet understanding of the situation in Vietnam and its foreign policy.

The talks will continue.

Gromyko Hosts Kremlin Dinner

LD1909164388 Moscow TASS in English 1638 GMT 19 Sep 88

[Text] Moscow September 19 TASS—Dinner in honour of Vo Chi Cong, member of the Politburo of the Communist Party of Vietnam Central Committee and president of the State Council of Vietnam, was given on behalf of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet in the Kremlin today.

Vo Chi Cong is staying in Moscow on an official friendly visit.

Andrey Gromyko, member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and president of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, and Vo Chi Cong made speeches during the dinner which passed in a warm and friendly atmosphere.

Gromyko Kremlin Speech

PM2009100988 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 20 Sep 88 Second Edition p 4

["In a Friendly Atmosphere"—PRAVDA headline]

[Text] In the Great Kremlin Palace today, a dinner was given in honor of Vo Chi Cong, member of the Communist Party of Vietnam [CPV] Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the SRV Council of State, on behalf of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium.

With the guest were the Vietnamese officials accompanying him on his trip.

On the Soviet side, Andrey Gromyko, Vitaliy Vorotnikov, Viktor Chebrikov, Vadim Medvedev, and other officials were present.

Andrey Gromyko, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, made a speech at the dinner. He said:

We are happy to cordially welcome to the Soviet Union the eminent representative of a fraternal country, Vo Chi Cong, member of the CPV Central Committee Politburo, chairman of the SRV Council of State.

Soviet people know you well as an authoritative figure in the CPV, a staunch campaigner for the freedom and unity of your country and for the triumph of the ideals of socialism on Vietnamese soil, a champion of Soviet-Vietnamese friendship and a well-known statesman.

We are sure, Comrade Vo Chi Cong, that your first official visit to the USSR as chairman of the SRV Council of State will serve well to consolidate the bonds of traditional friendship that link our parties and peoples.

International life now finds itself at a crucial, historic stage. Its range is colorful and the trends in the present-day community of states are diverse. In these conditions both the joint analysis with friends of the processes occurring in the world, and the exchange of views on ways of speeding up the development of socialist countries acquire an ever-increasing value and ever more profound practical sense.

Our people have an expression: "To work until one is dripping with sweat." The Vietnamese know very well the expression: "Anything can happen in the fields of Vietnam: Sometimes even a stone will pour with sweat." Such figurative expressions are born among those peoples who know well the cost of dogged work. Both the Soviet and the Vietnamese peoples cherish the fraternal friendship which links working people who are building socialism.

Soviet-Vietnamese relations are successfully developing on the basis of the treaty of friendship and cooperation, which marks its 10th anniversary this year. They have become an organic part of the life of the Soviet and Vietnamese people. The community of ideology, and loyalty to the principles of socialist internationalism form the firm foundation on which relations between our parties and countries rest. At the present stage, mutual assistance and cooperation in the course of revolutionary reforms and the renewal of socialism are gaining particular significance.

Such is the substance and political meaning of cooperation between the Soviet Union and Vietnam. Evaluating this from the standpoints of restructuring and of the 19th all-union party conference, we can say that a sizeable capital has been accumulated in the sphere of Soviet-Vietnamese ties.

However, while speaking of the past, one must also look boldly into the future, where we must do even more. The people of Vietnam are persistently searching for new ways of bringing society on to a qualitatively different and

higher level of development, on the basis of the decisions of the Sixth CPV Congress. We sincerely welcome the efforts of our friends and wish them success.

Undoubtedly, a very important place in Soviet-Vietnamese ties belongs to economic cooperation. The accords reached during the meetings between Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and Nguyen Van Linh in May of last year and July of this year testify to the need for further improvement.

In striving to make serious advances in economic ties, we believe we should also speed things up on the path of restructuring in other spheres of our cooperation. In this the supreme legislative bodies of our countries, with close monitoring by deputies of the implementation of programs of cooperation, not only centrally but also locally, could achieve a great deal. In the Soviet Union we value the mutual understanding that has formed between our countries in international affairs, including regions, and also the firm unity of views on key issues of the day. We are unanimous that today the face of the planet and its individual regions are to a large degree determined by the deep penetration into people's minds of the new political thinking, which is reflected increasingly more often in the practical actions of states. In essence the specific bearings of these actions, aimed at making life on earth more secure, have taken shape.

The main direction among them is the reduction of arms, primarily nuclear arms. The implementation of the first Soviet-U.S. Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles will for the first time in history not just eliminate a certain class of nuclear missiles, but it also opens up a direct road toward a major reduction in strategic offensive weapons and toward the galvanization of talks on reductions and destruction of many other kinds of weaponry.

Hundreds and thousands of people are still perishing in the flames of armed confrontations in various continents. Hence another important direction of the foreign policy struggle ensues—that for elimination of hotbeds of regional conflict. There is positive experience here too. It has been expressed through the fact that the constructive idea of national reconciliation has started to make way for itself in one form or another in places where tension remains.

In this connection the political settlement process in Afghanistan acquires special significance. The Soviet Union considers that successful completion of this process should bring the long-awaited peace. For this to happen, just one thing is needed—the constructive political will of all parties involved. Those who continue to violate their obligations under the Geneva agreement should understand the responsibility they will have to bear before the Afghans, their own people, world public opinion, and history.

Positive changes have appeared—and we note this with satisfaction—in the quest for a solution to the Cambodian conflict. Here, too, a mighty impulse for progress was produced by the idea of national reconciliation as advanced by the People's Republic of Kampuchea. The good will of Vietnam and Cambodia in declaring the withdrawal of a major Vietnamese troop contingent from Cambodian soil by the end of the year has largely assisted progress. Indonesia and a number of other states in Eastern Asia are also doing their bit to bring closer a political settlement.

Now, when the foundations are being laid for talks between the Cambodian sides, it is important to ensure favorable external conditions. China, the United States, and the ASEAN members may, of course, have an important contribution to make in a plan to further the attainment of a positive solution to the Cambodian problem.

For understandable reasons, a considerable part in our relations with Vietnam is devoted to Asia-Pacific security. We believe that here, as in other regions of the world, mistrust and confrontation must gradually give way to mutual understanding and a constructive dialogue.

We sincerely hope that the present difficulties in Vietnamese-Chinese relations will be overcome as quickly as possible. More favorable conditions for this are taking shape, including those in connection with prospects for a solution to the Cambodian conflict based on the policy of national reconciliation that has emerged.

I think that it may be said that the Soviet Union and Vietnam and the parliaments of our countries will continue to deepen interaction in the struggle to establish peace, universal security, and cooperation between the states of Southeast Asia, the Asia-Pacific region, and throughout the world.

The foreign policy of the CPSU and the Soviet state, and the new large-scale initiatives advanced by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev in Krasnoyarsk are directed toward these noble ends, which meet the interests of all peoples. We would like to especially stress not just the broad range of these initiatives, but also the huge potential they contain should the road to agreement be found through them. Naturally, this requires a deeply responsible approach to their analysis, and the Soviet Union is prepared for such analysis.

A glance into the immediate future shows both countries stand before a steep climb, both in domestic affairs and in the international arena. The closer we collaborate in all spheres and the firmer we go forward hand in hand, the easier it will be for us to make the climb, to reach new summits. We have all the conditions necessary for that, we have a most reliable support—the close solidarity of ruling parties, the CPSU and the CPV—and the fraternity of two creative nations, which has been tested by time and trials.

I wish you, Comrade Vo Chi Cong, the CPV leadership, and all Vietnamese Communists successful fulfillment of the tasks outlined for socialist construction.

Allow me to make a toast in honor of Vo Chi Cong, chairman of the SRV State Council, and in honor of all Vietnamese comrades present here.

May the relations of fraternal friendship and fruitful cooperation between our parties, countries, and peoples grow stronger. Then Vo Chi Cong made a speech.

Vo Chi Cong Dinner Speech

PM2009123188 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
20 Sep 88 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report on a speech given by Vo Chi Cong, member of the Communist Party of Vietnam (CPV) Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the SRV Council of State, at a Kremlin dinner 19 September given in his honor by A.A. Gromyko, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium: "In a Friendly Atmosphere"]

[Text] Let me first express sincere gratitude to the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium for the invitation to visit the Soviet Union and for your warm reception from the beginning of my stay in the Land of the Soviets.

I have frequently visited your wonderful country and sensed the Soviet people's sincere liking for our people. In the course of my present visit to the Soviet Union we are witnessing the inspired, intensive work that the CPSU and the entire Soviet people are resolutely carrying out to implement the decisions of the 27th party congress and deepen the processes of restructuring in all spheres of Soviet society's life. Our people are following the course of renewal in the Soviet Union with profound hope and attention. We assess highly the great significance of the 19th all-union party conference and the decisions adopted there aimed at further developing economic reform and democratizing Soviet society.

The profound changes that have been taking place in the world in the last 3 years are indissolubly linked with the dynamic and creative foreign policy activity of the CPSU and the Soviet state. The foreign policy course put forward by the 27th CPSU Congress and now being consistently and successfully implemented is the extension and development of Lenin's ideas on peace, security, and international cooperation in the conditions of the modern era. The implementation of this course is creating new opportunities for preventing the threat of nuclear war, preserving peace and human civilization, and implementing mankind's most cherished aspirations. We fully support the USSR's constructive steps aimed at consolidating peace and settling regional conflicts by political means. We assess highly the Geneva agreements on Afghanistan and welcome the goodwill of the USSR and Afghanistan, which are undeviatingly observing the existing accords. At the same time we demand that the United States and Pakistan strictly fulfill their pledges.

We are profoundly conscious that the source of the victories won in recent decades in the struggle to defend our motherland and build socialism in Vietnam lies in the undying ideas of Marxism-Leninism and the Great October Socialist Revolution. These victories are inseparable from the tremendous, effective assistance and support of our dear Soviet brothers. Our people will always be grateful to the CPSU and the Soviet people for their exceptionally valuable aid to the Vietnamese revolution.

At present the CPV and our people are concentrating their efforts on implementing the course put forward by the sixth party congress to renew the country and overcome existing difficulties with a view to developing production and stabilizing and boosting step by step the population's standard of living. In this work we are endeavoring to study and creatively apply in Vietnamese conditions the valuable experience of the USSR and other fraternal countries. The accords attained at the Vietnamese-Soviet summit meetings held in May 1987 and June this year confirmed the determination of our parties and our peoples to render bilateral cooperation more effective and efficient. Broad prospects are opening up for the development of new forms of cooperation in many spheres of production in accordance with the interests of our countries' peoples.

Our party and state deem the strengthening of our fraternal friendship and multifaceted cooperation with the Soviet Union an immutable principle in its foreign policy and will do everything possible to develop it steadfastly.

We firmly support the PRK's seven-point program aimed at achieving a just and reasonable resolution of the Cambodian problem. We welcome the success of the informal meeting held recently in Jakarta, all of whose participants agreed that withdrawing the Vietnamese troops and preventing a restoration of the genocidal Pol Pot regime are key, interdependent elements in a political settlement of the Cambodian problem. We welcome the constructive efforts of nonaligned countries and interested countries to seek a political solution to the Cambodian problem. As has been stated, the PRK and the SRV have set the term for the withdrawal of the Vietnamese volunteer troops for the end of 1989 at the earliest and the first quarter of 1990 at the latest. The schedule for the Vietnamese troop withdrawal must be matched by the cessation of military aid to the Khmer opposition sides and the cessation of outside interference in Cambodia's affairs.

Vietnam fully supports the seven-point proposals put forward by Laos at the informal meeting in Jakarta and is fully determined to help create a nuclear weapons-free

zone of peace, friendship, and cooperation in Southeast Asia in close contact with the Soviet Union, Laos, Cambodia, and other countries. Vietnam welcomes the USSR's constructive initiatives expounded in the important speech made by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, in Krasnoyarsk and deems them the Soviet Union's latest contribution to the cause of peace and security in the Asia-Pacific region. The SRV will continue tirelessly striving to achieve these noble aims.

We have always valued and still value our age-old friendship with the Chinese people, and we are prepared to meet with the Chinese side in order to discuss and resolve problems in relations between the two countries with a view to restoring the traditional ties of friendship between Vietnam and China and contributing to the cause of peace, security, and cooperation in the Asia-Pacific region and to the resolution of the Cambodian problem.

The talks and meetings held in the course of this visit have convincingly demonstrated our common determination to further enrich the forms and substance of the fraternal cooperation between our countries. I hope that the beneficial results of the visit will add new hues to the picture of Soviet-Vietnamese friendship and cooperation.

The visitor advocated the further development of friendship and multifaceted cooperation between the two parties and peoples and wished the Soviet people great successes in restructuring and successful fulfillment of the 27th CPSU Congress and 19th all-union party conference decisions.

Applause greeted the speeches made by A.A. Gromyko and Vo Chi Cong. The dinner took place in a warm and friendly atmosphere.

Vo Chi Cong laid a wreath at the V.I. Lenin Mausoleum. He honored the memory of the founder of the CPSU and the world's first socialist state with a minute's silence.

A wreath was also laid at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier. The visitor paid his respects to Soviet soldiers who died in the struggle against fascism for the sake of peace and the peoples' happiness.

Gromyko Presents Award

LD2009140388 Moscow TASS in English 1350 GMT 20 Sep 88

[Text] Moscow September 20 TASS—Andrey Gromyko, president of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, presented an Order of the October Revolution in the Kremlin today to Vo Chi Cong, a member of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Vietnam and president of the State Council of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam.

The Vietnamese party leader and statesman has been awarded the high Soviet distinction for his active part in the revolutionary movement and his wide-ranging and fruitful work to consolidate all-round cooperation between the USSR and Vietnam.

SRV Leaders Send Thanks for Jubilee Greetings

PM2009092188 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 18 Sep 88 Second Edition p 3

[SRV leaders' untitled message thanking Soviet leadership bodies for congratulations on SRV jubilee]

[Text] To the CPSU Central Committee

To the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium

To the USSR Council of Ministers.

We express sincere gratitude to the CPSU Central Committee, the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, the USSR Council of Ministers, and the fraternal Soviet people for their cordial congratulations on the occasion of the SRV's national holiday—the 43d anniversary of the proclamation of the country's independence.

We note with great satisfaction that the friendship and multifaceted cooperation between our countries are developing steadily and growing stronger on the basis of the Vietnamese-Soviet Treaty of Friendship and Cooperation, in accordance with the course of restructuring and renewal outlined by the 27th CPSU Congress and the 6th CPV Congress.

The recent summit meeting between Nguyen Van Linh, general secretary of the Communist Party of Vietnam [CPV] Central Committee, and M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, opened up new prospects for boosting the effectiveness of Vietnamese-Soviet cooperation in all spheres and strengthening the close coordination of our actions in the international arena.

We wish the fraternal Soviet people the successful fulfillment of the decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress and the 19th All-Union Party Conference.

Nguyen Van Linh, general secretary of the CPV Central Committee

Vo Chi Cong, chairman of the SRV Council of State.

Do Muoi, chairman of the SRV Council of Ministers

Le Quang Dao, chairman of the SRV National Assembly.

Philippines Welcomes Soviet Proposal on Bases
LD1909133688 Moscow TASS in English 1304 GMT 19 Sep 88

[Text] Manila September 19 TASS—Manuel Yan, Philippine deputy minister of foreign affairs, today expressed satisfaction with the Soviet Union's proposal to close down the fleet's material and technical supply station in Cam Ranh Bay if the United States eliminates its military bases in the Philippines.

"The new Soviet initiative is illustrative of good intentions of the USSR," Manuel Yan told journalists.

Katushev Receives Lao Economic Ties Official
PM1909102988 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 16 Sep 88 Morning Edition p 5

[TASS report under general heading "Official Reports"]

[Text] K.F. Katushev, USSR minister of foreign economic ties, had a conversation 14 September with Phao Bounnaphon, chairman of the Lao People's Democratic Republic State Committee for Foreign Economic Ties and Trade.

Near East & South Asia

Indian President Greets Gromyko From Aircraft
PM2009091588 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 18 Sep 88 Second Edition p 3

[TASS report: "In Flight"]

[Text] Indian President R. Venkataraman sent an in-flight telegram to A.A. Gromyko, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium. It says: "While flying over the territory of the Soviet Union, I want to send you once again a warm and friendly greeting on behalf of the people and Government of India. Please accept my cordial wishes for health, further progress, and prosperity to the entire friendly Soviet people."

Afghan Rebel on Help From U.S. 'Advisers'

LD1809044988 [Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1400 GMT on 17 September in its "Vremya" newscast carries a 30-minute program entitled "10 Days in Kabul," presented by an unnamed correspondent who was in Afghanistan at the end of the second phase of the Soviet troop withdrawal.

The program opens by noting that Soviet units are now in only 5 of 32 Afghan provinces and that the withdrawal is continuing in accordance with the timetable laid down by the Geneva accords. The video shows soldiers on top of armored personnel carriers and Afghan residents waving goodbye.

The correspondent says the question now is what Afghanistan will be like once the withdrawal is completed. The video shows street scenes and closeups of Afghans being interviewed. The correspondent observes that Afghans are tired of war. He adds that it would have been naive to expect the Geneva accords to lead to an immediate laying down of arms. He says that keeping one's word is a major Islamic tenet but the Pakistani authorities are deliberately violating the Geneva accords and are supporting the armed opposition. The correspondent says that in the 2 days he has been in Kabul, the city has been fired on by the mujahidin twice. The video shows damage inflicted by the insurgents' weapons, including, the correspondent says, U.S. Stingers and British Blowpipes brought in from Pakistani air bases. The video then shows scenes of damage in Shahr-e Naw. A resident is interviewed, saying that people had been warning that the Soviets were going to attack the city. The resident states that the Soviets were not the ones to fire on the city, but the "dushmans."

The correspondent notes that over the last 3 months more than 500 people have died in Kabul as a result of shelling and sabotage. The video shows a blown up bus, people on stretchers, a crying child, a missile being loaded and fired, and firefighters at the scene of a blaze.

The correspondent then interviews a group of "reconciled" insurgents and is seen sitting with them. The insurgents talk about how they were "deceived" and describe Gulbuddin Hikmatyar as a U.S. agent.

The correspondent describes the insurgents as former field commanders of Gulbuddin Hikmatyar and Rabbani and says that they left the rebel opposition a year ago. The video shows the commanders, identified as Azmuddin and Shahwali, and their detachments of fighters. The correspondent then asks an unidentified insurgent whether there had been any foreign military advisers among his group. The insurgent answers: "Yes, there were: American, Egyptian, and Iranian. They were in the camps and with the detachment when it was in Afghanistan. In the camps, they taught us how to handle various equipment, weapons, mortars, missiles, and machineguns for 6 months. Then they sent us here with an instructor. The instructions were to eliminate roads; destroy bridges, schools, and mosques; and kill party members and activists. If the money they got in Pakistan was not enough, they were to get it by force from the inhabitants. Moreover, every month they were to send a large sum to Pakistan. The instructors often forced us to attack a village and shoot the people. The detachment would change into Soviet uniforms and put everything on film and then show it as atrocities committed by the Soviets. I saw that myself."

[Correspondent] "Is it true that a specific price was set for every representative of the people's authorities and for every Soviet soldier or officer, for every one killed?"

[Insurgent] "Yes, it is true. For example, for a Soviet soldier, 800,000 afghanis and for an Afghan, 300,000-400,000. Often this money is taken by the commander in Pakistan and they often make us pay elevated tributes for those killed. They receive dollars, after all, and must account for them."

The insurgents then describe how they became disillusioned with Hikmatyar and decided to return to Afghanistan.

The video shows the village of Shiwaki, 20 km from Kabul, where village elders have organized self-defense groups. Young men and boys carrying weapons are shown and are heard explaining their defense role and how they will manage after the Soviet withdrawal is completed.

The video then shows Afghanistan's "main military force"—the Afghan Army in a march-past. Najibullah is seen on the rostrum; jets are flying overhead and armored personnel carriers are seen driving past.

The video then shows scenes from Konduz: ruined buildings, fires, and homeless people. The correspondent says that the cause of what happened was disagreement among the province leaders, their distance from the people, cowardice, and a "defeatist" attitude. He adds that the Armemd Forces are being strengthened and that party battalions and regiments of the Afghan Guard are being set up.

The correspondent notes that bullets cannot solve everything and national reconciliation is the key. The video shows Najibullah addressing the Meli Shura.

The video then shows members of the Meli Shura debating. Over scenes of daily life, the correspondent relates a "reluctance born of ignorance" on the part of the public to take part in political life and errors committed by the PDPA in its intial determination to do everything immediately.

The correspondent says that dogmatism is giving way, customs are being taken into account, and there is a flourishing private economy. He states: "At the cost of compromises, concessions, and sharing power with representatives of other forces, the PDPA is striving for what is most important: retaining the country's territorial integrity, preventing it from being thrown back 100 years, and ensuring democratic government."

The video then shows a still of Afghan Prime Minister Sharq and his biography is related. He is shown answering questions at a news conference. The correspondent says that he asked the prime minister what the future holds for Afghanistan. Sharq is shown replying to the question at the news conference, saying that the government must draw the correct conclusions from its mistakes and not repeat those of the past.

The program ends with scenes from Kabul, showing the trading areas of Shahr-e Naw, where both traditional goods and the latest imports can be seen. The video then shows children playing in the streets and the final scenes are of a wedding celebration.

Polyakov Meets With PLO Officials in Tunis

PM1509113988 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 15 Sep 88 Morning Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Conversation With PLO Leaders"]

[Text] Tunis, 14 Sep—Between 11-13 September meetings took place in Tunis between V.P. Polyakov, member of the Collegium of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and Yasir 'Arafat, chairman of the PLO Executive Committee. There were also discussions with members of the PLO Executive Committee: Faruq Qaddumi, leader of the PLO political department and member of the Fatah Central Committee; Abu Mazin [Mahmud 'Abbas], member of the Fatah Central Committee; Sulayman al-Najjab, member of the Palestinian Communist Party Central Committee Politburo; Yasir 'Abd Rabbuh, deputy general secretary of the Democratic Front for the Liberation of Palestine; and Abdullah Hurani. There was a detailed exchange of views on issues concerning the situation in the Near East and the achievement of the speediest possible political settlement to the Arab-Israeli conflict.

Y. 'Arafat and other Palestinian leaders informed the Soviet representative about the PLO leadership's efforts to implement the legal right of the Arab Palestinian people to self-determination and the reinstatement of peace in the Near East on the basis of equality and mutual security.

Both sides stressed that recent events in the region, including the widespread peaceful actions of the Palestinians in the terrorities occupied by Israel, create a situation favorable to starting the process of achieving an all-embracing Near East settlement.

An accord was reached on continuing the Soviet-Palestinian dialogue and on the exchange of views on the issues of establishing peace in the Near East and achieving a just solution of the Palestinian problem.

A discussion also took place between V.P. Polyakov and Chedli Klibi, secretary general of the Arab League.

CPSU Delegation Departs for Damascus 16 Sep

PM2009093188 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 17 Sep 88 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Delegation's Departure"]

[Text] A delegation of CPSU party workers headed by S.A. Osminin, first secretary of the Kirov CPSU Obkom, left Moscow for Damascus 16 September in accordance with the plan for ties between the CPSU and the Syrian Ba'th Party.

Syrian Official Meets Group

JN1709195888 Damascus Domestic Service in Arabic 1815 GMT 17 Sep 88

[Text] 'Abdallah al-Ahmar, assistant secretary general of the Arab Socialist Ba'th Party, this evening received a CPSU fact-finding delegation headed by Comrade Osminin, secretary of the RSFSR's Kirov Obkom. Aleksandr Dzasokhov, USSR ambassador in Damascus, attended.

During the meeting, the conversation revolved around the developing relations between the Arab Socialist Ba'th Party and the CPSU, around the experience and activity of the two friendly parties in mass action, and around their role in building and developing the society.

During the meeting, Comrade al-Ahmar asserted the importance, strength, and continuous development of friendship between the two friendly parties and countries in the service of the common struggle, socialism, security, peace, and their mutual interests.

Comrade Osminin praised the developments and progress witnessed by Syria under the leadership of the Ba'th Party and its secretary general, struggler Comrade Hafiz al-Asad. He asserted the USSR's appreciation of Syria's progressive approach against imperialist plots and Israeli aggression against Arabs in the region. He wished the Syrian Arab people more prosperity.

East Europe

Polish Sejm Accepts Government's Resignation

LD1909211188 Moscow TASS in English 2057 GMT 19 Sep 88

[Text] Warsaw September 20 TASS—The Polish Sejm (parliament) accepted the government's resignation by a majority vote Monday night.

The Sejm instructed the outgoing Council of Ministers to perform its duties until a new government is formed.

It also approved a resolution on implementation of the reform and the social and economic situation in the country.

Further on Sejm Session

LD2009083088 Moscow TASS in English 0817 GMT 20 Sep 88

[Text] Warsaw September 20 TASS—The indisputable demand now is to make further changes and radical acceleration of the economic reform and achievement of the set social goals, points out a decision adopted by the Polish Sejm on Monday on realization of the reform and the acute social and economic situation in the country. Serious difficulties arose in the way of these changes in the past year. A combination of high price growth rates with a growing shortage of goods stepped up discontent and impatience of population.

It is necessary to stake on everything that serves real revitalization of the economy and the state, says the decision. Various threats and attempts to disrupt public law and order in the state and normal work in the economy certainly do not serve this goal. Their consequences would be dangerous for the population and for the national economy, as well for the process of reforms and national concord.

The Sejm said that the success of the reform also depended on changes in the system of organs of power. It voiced support for continuing the reform of central government departments and strict definition of relations and delineation of tasks between government and political power.

Polish Politburo, Trade Union Discussion Noted

PM1609114788 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 16 Sep 88 p 3

[TASS report: "'Roundtable' Dialogue"]

[Text] Warsaw, 15 Sep—The PZPR Central Committee Politburo and the leadership of the All-Polish Trade Union Alliance [OPZZ] advocated continuing efforts leading to expanding the sphere of national agreement; this has fundamental significance for overcoming the crisis phenomena, accelerating the process of socialist renewal and reforms in political, economic, and social life. This is stressed in a report on a PZPR Central Committee Politburo session in which the OPZZ leaders took part. Only constant dialogue and collaboration can guarantee Poland's successful development and create conditions for achieving the long-awaited improvement in citizens' life, the report says.

Condemning attempts by certain circles to reduce the "roundtable" talks to trading according to the notorious "all or nothing" principle, the session participants noted that general questions of change in the system of exercising power in the country's political, social, and economic life must be jointly discussed and agreed upon during the discussions.

In the discussion it was stressed that the principle of permitting one trade union per enterprise enables that trade union to express all the workers' demands and also to elaborate a program and form a leadership in accordance with the will of the collective majority.

Analyzing the socioeconomic situation, the session participants admitted that one of the reasons for the population's dissatisfaction is the deepening sense of social injustice stemming from a lack of coordination between wages and work results. The Politburo acknowledged that it is essential to step up discipline in the sphere of prices and labor compensation, particularly in the material production sphere, and to make wage rises strictly conditional on increased production and market deliveries.

Zaykov Completes Visit to Bulgaria, Returns

PM2009091188 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 17 Sep 88 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Visit Completed"]

[Text] Varna, 16 Sep—The working visit to Bulgaria by L.N. Zaykov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and first secretary of the Moscow CPSU Gorkom, has ended.

Today he visited the Varna "Elektron" combine. With him was O. Doynov, member of the BCP Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the "Heavy Machine Building" association.

This enterprise, whose collective numbers about 4,500 workers and engineers, specializes in the production and installation of printed circuit boards for the electronics industry and radio and medical apparatus. The combine has close ties with related Soviet enterprises. Output worth a total of about R100 million is dispatched from here to the USSR every year.

The CPSU Central Committee secretary was familiarized with the work of the shops and manufacturing sectors fitted with modern equipment and talked with the combine's workers, specialists, and leadership about the transition to economic accountability and self-financing. Special attention was paid to questions of improving the enterprise's cooperation with partners in Moscow, Leningrad, and Rostov. The need was stressed for the fuller use of the rights which Soviet and Bulgarian enterprises have today to increase production efficiency and update output, including consumer goods. These tasks could be successfully resolved by creating joint enterprises as the supreme form of economic integration between two countries.

L.N. Zaykov was acquainted with the activity of "Golden Sands"—one of the largest enterprises within the "Balkanturist" resort complex—and with the working people's leisure conditions and with the possibilities of expanding tourist exchange between the USSR and Bulgaria.

Questions of the further development of ties with the enterprises of Moscow Oblast and City were discussed with the leadership of the Varna Okrug BCP Committee and Okrug People's Council.

The meetings with T. Zhivkov and other party and state leaders of the republic and its capital and the talks with Bulgarian working people reflected a high degree of mutual understanding and a qualitatively new level of cooperation between the CPSU and the BCP and the two countries and peoples.

At Varna airport the Soviet guest was seen off by G. Filipov, member of the Politburo and secretary of the BCP Central Committee, and other officials.

V.V. Sharapov, USSR ambassador to Bulgaria, was among the send-off party.

Hungarian Trade Unions' Shortcomings Viewed

PM1509084988 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 14 Sep 88 p 9

[Marina Shakina article under the rubric "Looking at Our Friends": "Trade Unions? Yes!"]

[Text] Some 4 months have already elapsed since the party conference in Hungary. The party forum which elected a new MSZMP Politburo (as recently as 3 years ago none of the present members of the Politburo was yet a member of the highest organ of party leadership) set a new tone for all social life in the country.

The Hungarian trade unions, which incorporate 93 percent of the Hungarian working people in their ranks, were among the first to respond to the party's appeal for renewal.

The deteriorating economic situation of recent years placed the trade unions in a difficult position: The efforts of the government to stabilize the economy created a novel "environment" for the trade unions and forced them to tackle an unfamiliar range of questions. Price increases and a hardline wage policy inevitably cast doubt on the achieved standard of living, and the policy of eliminating loss-making enterprises was fraught with the danger of temporary unemployment in the country.

Society turned with hope toward the trade unions—it was they who were destined to act as an equal partner in the discussion with the state of the accumulated problems. How did they cope with their role? Many people were disillusioned with the result of their efforts. The trade unions were criticized for passiveness, for lagging behind events.

The trade union gains—extended period of notice, job placement allowance, retraining allowance—did not greatly impress public opinion: This traditional trade union work proved insufficient in the new situation, in which whole strata of society felt socially undefended.

The dissatisfaction with the content of trade union work took various forms. A quite noticeable exodus of working people from the trade unions (expected to reach 15 percent) set in. In scientific circles the wave of resignations from the trade unions took place when it emerged that the state was reducing the Academy of Sciences budget by 15 percent. That meant cuts in research and staffing. Scientific personnel traditionally belonging to the employees' union decided that their interests were not being safeguarded and that "rescuing the drowning was a matter for the drowning themselves," and they

organized their own specialized trade union and took a number of other steps (for instance, public commissions for identifying reserves in the economy have been set up at many scientific institutes. The aim everywhere is the same—to avoid cuts).

The new socioeconomic reality gave birth to some quite unexpected phenomena: The tax system introduced in the country as of 1 January 1988 has wiped out many additional payments and bonuses, made overtime unprofitable, and raised the question of the value of basic working time. Yet in many cases management was resolving the problem of the shortage of labor by means of well-paid overtime. Recently the trade union newspaper NEPSZAVA carried a report about a strike of extras at the capital's opera just before the premiere of "Tristan and Isolde." They were demanding a higher rate of pay for appearances. The production was in jeopardy and the management, after on-site talks, made a decision to double the rate. Characteristically, the opera trade union committee, which had unsuccessfully appealed to management more than once to attend to the extras problem, fully supported the theater personnel's action.

Yet the defense of working people's interests is the very least that society expects of trade unions. More and more frequently voices can be heard advocating that trade unions should elaborate their own concept of development, defend their own stance, and make a contribution to the formulation of the political course—in short, trade unions are viewed as an important institution of socialist pluralism.

At the June session of the National Trade Union Council a new general secretary of the organization was elected. He is the 42-year old Sandor Nagy—an energetic, flexible, sober-minded, and popular politician who is an economist by education.

In one of the first speeches in his new post the general secretary named among the key tasks of the biggest public mass organization the drafting of a law on trade unions which would define the legal framework for their activities, lay down legitimate ways of resolving labor conflicts, and enshrine the "classic" rights of trade unions up to and including the right to strike. Whereas in the past we proceeded from the premise that under socialism the employer and the worker are one and the same person, Sandor Nagy says, now with the development of ownership relations in society these functions are becoming increasingly divided, and it is from this that the vital tasks of the trade unions ensue.

TASS, CTK Press Agencies Sign Agreement

PM1909140588 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 16 Sep 88 Morning Edition p 5

[TASS report under general heading: "Official Reports"]

[Text] An agreement was signed in the Polish [as published] capital Wednesday [14 September] between TASS and CTK in the sphere of exchange of information on an equal and reciprocal basis.

Political & Social

Gorbachev's Krasnoyarsk Speech Published

PM1909122188 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 18 Sep 88 Second Edition pp 1-3

[Unattributed report on speech by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, at a 16 September meeting in Krasnoyarsk with representatives of the working people of Krasnoyarsk Kray: "Time for Action, Time for Practical Work. M.S. Gorbachev's Speech in Krasnoyarsk"]

[Text] Comrades, this is not the first time that I have visited Siberia. In the past I have visited Altay Kray and Novosibirsk Oblast and passed through Irkutsk and Krasnoyarsk. As general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, I have already become familiar with Tyumen Oblast. I think that that trip proved both necessary and useful. In the summer of 1986 I was able to familiarize myself with the life and activity of the working people of the Maritime and Khabarovsk Krays, those major regions of the Far East.

And now my trip to Krasnoyarsk Kray. During my stay in your kray, I have visited production collectives, talked with workers, and met with farmers in Shushenskiy Rayon. I have met with scientists and specialists and kray, city, and rayon leaders. In general, this will help me to have a better understanding of the problems worrying not only you but also the entire country.

After the 19th party conference, which adopted important decisions on the deepening of economic reform, reform of the political system, and the democratization of the entire life of Soviet society, the time has come for vigorous practical work to fulfill these decisions. We now have a policy—the policy of restructuring—targeted on major tasks and at renewing our society and bringing it to new levels in order to ensure Soviet society's transition to a qualitatively new level. I believe that this is the great gain of the first phase of restructuring. We have made major decisions with regard to the main areas of restructuring.

It was necessary to investigate how to progress further. Everything did not go smoothly, but it was done thoroughly and involved all of society. A very crucial stage has now arrived, the time to implement what we have elaborated together with you, although this work will also be continued. It is precisely because our policy of restructuring is moving into the plane of practical implementation that restructuring thus applies to every party organization, every labor collective, every oblast, republic, and kray, and all the country's workers. Of course, this also applies to you Siberians.

The CPSU Central Committee and the Soviet Government are devoting great attention to the development of Siberia and the Far East. This is above all due to the role that these regions play today, and especially to the increasing significance they will have in the fate of our state.

It is also of no little importance that the Soviet Union comes into contact here with the states and the peoples of the Asian Continent. So from the foreign policy viewpoint Siberia and the Far East are of tremendous significance.

The opening up of Siberia and the Far East is our common nationwide task. The programs that have been elaborated and adopted are also geared to this. They may be incomplete in some areas and maybe even in essential areas. We sense this, and scientists and economic leaders have also suggested this to us. Yes, both the meetings and conversations here on Krasnoyarsk soil have shown that these programs must be amended in the light of the problems raised here.

But even today these regions make a huge contribution to the country's economy. Suffice it to say that they provide two-thirds of the oil and gas, more than 40 percent of the coal, 20 percent of the electrical power, and 37 percent of commercial timber shipments. These are irreplaceable and invaluable resources without which society cannot exist.

This kray possesses vast land and water resources. Last year Siberia and the Far East produced more than 24 million tonnes of grain, almost 2 million tonnes of meat, virtually 11 million tonnes of milk, and 4.9 million tonnes of fish.

Siberia is rich in stocks of nonferrous, noble, and rare metals, which form a considerable proportion of our national wealth. In short, the country cannot survive without what Siberia and the Far East provide.

We must express profound gratitude to Siberians and the people of the Far East and to everyone who lives and works here for their tremendous selfless work. At the same time it is fair to say something else: In their turn these regions need the entire country to take an active part in their development. This in essence is how matters stand, comrades.

However, when considering the present and, particularly, the prospects for the entire country's development, we must see the whole picture of life in these regions—both the achievements and also the great problems that have accumulated, the miscalculations, and even the mistakes, which are not only of a local and regional character but also, unfortunately, of a strategic order. We must be aware of them, critically assess them, and draw the requisite conclusions for the future. This lesson is of vital necessity for us. Especially now, when we are drawing up vast and far-reaching development plans.

It is these problems that have been the focus of all the meetings and conversations held these last few days. Generally, the question of how restructuring is in fact proceeding in Krasnoyarsk Kray's labor collectives was discussed. It must be said that during the numerous conversations I had in workshops, scientific establishments, in the fields, and in city and village streets, I wanted to elucidate many questions of interest to the CPSU Central Committee and the government. At the same time I sensed that the people of Krasnoyarsk also wanted to tell me a great deal and to give the Central Committee and the government their opinions and assessments of the state of affairs in the kray and of the progress of restructuring.

What can I say in this connection? People have now begun to have a more profound understanding of the significance of restructuring both for the country and for socialism as a whole. They—and I mean most people—clearly understand that restructuring will not take off until every labor collective and every person really tackles the resolution of the new tasks. I am pleased that this idea was also voiced in the comrades' speeches today at the start of our meeting. There were many critical comments both about the work of central organs—especially ministries and departments—and also about the activity of local party, soviet, and economic organs and leading cadres. In my opinion, everything was said sincerely, bluntly, and with an ardent desire and hope that this will be heard, taken into consideration in our work, and resolved.

On the whole I am very pleased with the nature of the conversations, which were open and even of a confidential nature. Of course, both I and the people I met had little time at our disposal. That is why people did not touch upon everything that has been done and gained. Everyone said that that is already ours now and concentrated on the problems and unresolved questions in order to draw attention to them. I assessed this accordingly.

In general, I really felt and saw that the people of Krasnoyarsk have accepted restructuring. Is this conclusion correct? (voices: It is).

Restructuring is blazing a trail over the entire vast territory of Krasnoyarsk Kray. Step by step it is entering into the life of labor collectives, families, cities, villages, and rayons. That's the main thing, comrades.

But something else is equally important: The people of Krasnoyarsk are worried about the progress of restructuring and about the fact that everything is not going as they wished. The desire to resolve everything a little more rapidly is understandable. Here you were correct when you said that the decisions that are being adopted must be fulfilled. People mentioned this many times, and very bluntly moreover. Everyone deemed it necessary to stress the idea that exactingness must be increased. Responsibility has been weakened to some extent. This applies to everyone—not only leading cadres but labor collectives, too. It was also said that discipline and order need to be strengthened.

Comrades, I have already spoken about this and I want to reiterate once again that restructuring will not progress without organization, responsibility, and order. On the contrary, since it encompasses all spheres of life and is linked with profound changes in them, it can only be implemented by reinforcing responsibility and discipline based on the realization of the need for changes and on increasing exactingness toward one another.

What particularly struck me—I saw this for myself today in a conversation with the members of the party kraykom bureau and the krayispolkom—people in general see that time, new resources, and much effort will be needed in order to resolve the big problems. We will have to organize ourselves well and augment our forces, so to speak, in order to achieve new levels on major issues. People understand this, and this does the Siberians credit. But in our conversations they clearly differentiated between questions that are part of the group of major issues that will require time, and questions which should and could have been resolved at the initial phase of restructuring.

In actual fact, do we really need years to eliminate problems when it comes to fuel, leaking roofs, lack of running water in apartment blocks throughout a microrayon, unlit streets, disruptions in city transport operations, and so on? This is what people spoke about. And what is it that embitters them most? The fact that the lack of solutions to these questions stems from the work of economic and soviet cadres. Therefore, there is insufficient party attention and party control.

Now the party kraykom is making great demands of soviets and economic organs alike, taking them rigorously to task for specific work in all areas, and is constantly monitoring the central issues which bother people. This is correct, and I would like to support this approach. I think that people's worth is especially clearly visible now. Economic accountability shows people's real character and their attitude toward the work in hand. From the very beginning restructuring showed the worth of people holding various positions. Some of them are working in the way they used to work 3, 4, 5, and even 10 years ago. And everything is, as people's say, "like water off a duck's back."

But I think that such cadres will not remain in their positions for long unless they sharply change their stance. I sensed this in the people's mood; it has already manifested itself in the course of the report-back and election campaign in party organizations, and it will also be manifested during the formation of the soviets, in the course of meetings with deputies, and so on. Thus, we will draw correct conclusions from all this.

Here is something else I would like to say: We must not give in to difficulties. I heard it said in places: It looks as if nothing is changing here and nothing gets done.

But, comrades, restructuring is a serious and profound matter. It affects the entire country and all spheres of life. It represents thorough work to transform our society's entire life. In view of this, we can have no illusions. As a matter of fact, we realized this when we embarked on restructuring. We also realize only too well now that the next few years will be most complex and most difficult.

Life confirms this. Therefore, whenever I am told with such ardor and passion that difficulties are accumulating and there are many problems, I draw the conclusion: This means that restructuring is under way in real life. It raises more and more new problems which must be solved. Nobody will solve them for us. Of course, we perceive the difficult progress of the restructuring processes in the party itself, in the soviets, and in the activity of leadership cadres and labor collectives. We see how our entire society finds it difficult to learn the lessons of glasnost and democracy, the new approaches in economic affairs. We perceive the demolition of established views as the country becomes more and more deeply involved in the restructuring of our economy on the principles of radical economic reform.

Comrades, it must be bluntly said that we are being taught major lessons. We are learning to live and work in a new fashion, even to build our relations in a new fashion. We must without fail to withstand and cope with the major commitments of the present stage of restructuring. This applies to cadres and to all labor collectives.

I mention this also because, at this responsible and crucial time, we have begun to hear people talk about the threat to restructuring. Some people, failing to realize the entire complexity of current problems, urge that they be dealt with in one fell swoop. What can be said about this? All this is very far removed from serious politics and real life and is dangerous for the cause. No matter what motivations may be guiding the advocates of such approaches, their views are unacceptable for the stated reasons and must be rejected. But the same resolve must be applied in rejecting also the views of those who are afraid of the galvanization of political processes, the democratization of society, the reform of the economy, the cooperative system with all its problems, the process of improving the state of spiritual and moral life, the interpretation of our history, and so on—those who perceive this innovative process which restructuring brings with it almost as a threat to socialism.

What the champions of extreme views have in common is the fact that both of them confuse people and sow doubts among them regarding the meaning and purpose of restructuring. Any extreme stance is scientifically erroneous and politically irresponsible. I am convinced that we will not let ourselves be diverted from our chosen path, and you Siberians have reinforced my confidence in the past few days with the firmness of your stance. We have chosen the path and we must march along it with firm and confident steps. There is no room here for any vacillation, for any doubts or hesitation at all. We know the cost to country and people of mistakes in the political sphere. And we must be very responsible.

If anything is to be said now with utmost firmness, it is the fact that it is necessary to fundamentally improve practical work along all avenues of restructuring. Moreover, guided by its long-term objectives, it is necessary to do everything possible in a short space of time to ease the strain in the decisive spheres of the people's life.

As you know, we have raised as paramount problems the food question, the housing question, and the provision of consumer goods and services. Conversing with you over the last few days I became convinced that we were right to do so, because these problems are acute here, too. The problems of health care and education are equally important. Ecological problems are becoming increasingly acute.

The Central Committee has demanded that central and local organs give priority to the solution of these problems. What is being done here? Opportunities have been sought to solve the housing construction problem by using centralized sources and enterprise funds and boosting cooperative and individual construction. This is already having an effect on the pace of housing construction. Some 300 million square meters of accommodation have been commissioned in 2 and ½ years. But the scale we have achieved is, of course, still not what is needed to enable us to solve our set task by the year 2000. A most difficult task. It is obviously necessary to approach it by mobilizing all of society's resources for its solution, since it affects the life of every family and every person. We have the potential. And this is graphically proved by the experience of various regions.

We have found ourselves in difficulties regarding consumer goods, both from the viewpoint of fully supplying the domestic market with a wide range of goods and from the viewpoint of the commodity quality. Now we are pursuing a line of boosting the output of goods by enterprises in all sectors, and not just in light industry.

Much remains to be done in this regard by the republics, krays, and oblasts themselves. The economic reform has created major opportunities for this. Nobody should stand aside and put the blame on others. Everyone must make his contribution to this work.

I would like to note that consumer goods production during the first 8 months of this year increased by R13 billion, or 6.3 percent, compared with last year. The volume of paid services increased by R5.1 billion, or

14.4 percent. But shortages of many light industry articles and even consumer durables remain considerable and acute. I have sensed this in the last few days after talking with residents of cities, villages, and workers' settlements.

There is something else. It is totally useless when many enterprises, taking advantage of economic accountability rights, try to improve their financial position only by boosting the output of expensive goods. And in the meantime very little is done to expand the output and range of cheap goods in mass demand. There are even some who have taken an antisocial path by cutting back the manufacture of cheap goods in mass demand. This phenomenon is perceived in the Central Committee and the government as a manifestation of group egoism which is impermissible in a socialist society. Imagine what would happen if everyone were to take the same attitude. We all, the consumers, will encounter this group egoism in stores and stalls. And we will revert to the situation we are now trying to escape from.

I would not like to restrict myself to just these critical remarks. I would like to call on leaders of all enterprises and labor collective councils to immediately look into the matter and impose the proper order here. This evidently shows that certain correctives must be implemented from the center and the appropriate economic measures elaborated and implemented.

Taking real needs into account, the USSR Government has sought opportunities for the additional manufacture of consumer goods worth R24 billion in the remaining 2 years of the 5-year plan period. Much work will of course be necessary for all this to be achieved and implemented.

Food supplies remain the most acute of our current problems, comrades. This problem also exists here, in Krasnoyarsk Kray. I am not going to deal with the history of the problem now, since it is rooted deep in the past. Let me say just this: The agrarian policy whose foundations were laid by Vladimir Ilich Lenin, the line of developing equivalence of exchange [ekvivalentnyy obmen] between city and countryside, between industry and agriculture, was inconsistently pursued for many decades on end, and was even grossly perverted in some periods. This had grave consequences for the agrarian sector itself, as well as for the country's entire economy. Mistakes in this important work have still not been overcome, and some comrades spoke of this here. I listened to Sovkhoz Director Comrade Veprev at the meeting at the USSR Academy of Sciences Siberian Department's Krasnoyarsk Affiliate on the 2d day of my stay in Krasnoyarsk. If I understood correctly, the same was said today by "Druzhba" Kolkhoz Chairman G.V. Batrtdinov, who painted a very sad picture of the state of affairs in the kray's agrarian sector.

True enough, a few things have been successfully corrected following the CPSU Central Committee May (1982) Plenum. The output of agricultural produce has started gradually increasing, even though not as fast as life demands. Bearing in mind that there had been virtually no progress in the 5 preceding years, while the situation prevailing before the 1975 drought was being reached again, it is obvious that we can no longer rest satisfied with this pace. Over the last 5 years gross grain harvest yields rose from 178 million tonnes in 1982 to 211 million tonnes in 1987. But this level will probably not be reached this year because large regions—Siberia, Kazakhstan, and the Volga region—are failing to meet harvest yield targets, even though the harvest is good in the Ukraine, the North Caucasus, and Central Russia.

Over the same period, meat production increased from 15.4 million tonnes to 18.9 million tonnes, milk production from 91 million tonnes to 104 million tonnes, and egg production from 72 billion to 82.7 billion eggs. Harvest yields increased by 10 percent for sugar beets, 6 percent for vegetables, and 3 percent for potatoes. All this happened after the May plenum. This plenum, with which we were not generally and totally satisfied, nevertheless addressed itself to the kolkhozes and sovkhozes and it produced a certain response in rural working people.

Has this eased the strain in food supplies? No, it has not. Life itself, comrades, has prompted us to tackle the need for a fundamental restructuring of economic relations in the countryside. The only thing that can be said is that we have delayed this work by decades. This, as a matter of fact, is one of the gravest political mistakes.

The main point here is to radically change people's attitudes toward the utilization of land and other production resources. We are convinced that this can be achieved in the best and swiftest possible way on the basis of various forms of contract and leasing—this is a central problem and it must be resolved everywhere. Conditions have now been created for this in our country, I mean the legal and economic conditions. Now it is up to our economic cadres.

I would like to touch on another question at our meeting, a question which has recently been the subject of quite frequent and acute debate. The question is: How much food do we consume? Some people believe that there are now fewer meat and dairy products in the country than in the past, that food supplies were better then. Probably many of you also believe this. And some people even claim that we now consume less meat than in 1927, on the eve of collectivization.

But what is the actual state of affairs? We will have to go back to 1927. At that time per capita meat production totaled 30 kg and per capita milk production 206 kg. In 1965 per capita consumption of meat and meat products totaled 40.6 kg, to which a 12.6 kg per capita consumption of fish has to be added. Per capita consumption of milk and dairy products totaled 251 kg. In 1987 the respective indicators looked like this: meat—64 kg, milk—341 kg, and fish—18 kg. Incidentally, the per

capita consumption of cream amounted to 4 kg in 1965 and 7.2 kg in 1987. To complete the picture I would like to say that the consumption of eggs totaled 124 per person in 1965, and 272 last year.

So where is the problem? Why are people left with the impression that shops were better supplied in the past, while at the moment everyone is experiencing food product shortages left, right, and center?

I was working at that time as Stavropol party kraykom second secretary responsible in particular for the food and the light industries. Anyone who worked in the economic sphere or in the soviets then will remember the problem that prevailed at that time: We did not know what to do with butter. It grew bitter and rancid and in order to preserve it we were making sour cream with a 30-percent fat content. And that, please note, while we were consuming 24 kg less meat, almost 100 kg less milk, some 6 kg less fish, and only just over half the amount of butter.

So what is the problem, comrades? We must take the increased purchasing power into account here. In 1965 only 4 percent of the country's population had a per capita income of R100 or more, whereas now it is 67 percent. As a result, many millions of people are now consuming high-grade food products which were inaccessible for them in the past. Over the years which have elapsed the urban population has increased manyfold. And the exodus from the countryside continues. All this has, so to speak, exacerbated the problem.

In order to understand the situation it is necessary to bear in mind that over these years a serious gulf has formed between the production growth rates of food and nonfood goods on the one hand, and the population's monetary income growth rates on the other hand. The production of consumer goods and the provision of services are considerably lagging behind the increase in monetary incomes. Money has been issued that was not backed up by end products.

What conclusion ought to be drawn from this? In order to overcome the deficit it is necessary to radically advance the production of agricultural produce and consumer goods.

As regards food, three tasks which brook no delay are in the forefront.

First, it is necessary, as I have already said, to radically change the economic relations in the countryside, and that means primarily giving the go-ahead everywhere to the collective contract, and in particular the lease contract, and to carry out a social restructuring of the countryside on a broad front with a view to achieving a situation whereby the people who are currently working in the countryside stay there.

Second, it is necessary to make economical use of the potential created within the agro-industrial complex and to identify additional material and technical resources and switch them to the agrarian sector.

And third, it is necessary without delay to resolve the question of the transportation, storage, and processing of the harvest that has been grown. This is where the most rapid return can be achieved.

Comrades, what is needed is more efficiency, concreteness, competence, and professionalism in our work. Incidentally, many people grasped this long ago, right at the beginning of restructuring. And they have already achieved a great deal by tackling the solution of the new tasks in a businesslike, practical fashion. Moreover, it is a question of a mass phenomenon rather than of isolated instances. This can already be felt throughout the country. Healthy, energetic restructuring forces have been set in motion.

Unfortunately, it has to be said that alongside the achievements and profound changes which are taking place in thousands of production collectives, old approaches and work that lacks initiative persist everywhere, and this applies to both new methods of management and questions of scientific and technical progress. It is here in particular that the situation is poor both in terms of plans and efficiency indicators. Enterprises are up to their eyes in debt. And what do the ministries do? They carry on working in the old style. They are taking from the front-ranking enterprises and using their incomes to subsidize the laggards.

What would I like to say in this context? Naturally, comrades, the socialist society is not indifferent to the fate of individual workers. However, at the same time we cannot adapt the economic reform to the freeloading attitudes of those who do not want to change their attitude toward work. We must understand this well, we must rigorously apply the principle of socialism—"from each according to his abilities, to each according to his labor"; we must resolutely overcome the tendency to establish unwarranted pay and bonus levels and pay out wages to people for coming to work without taking account of the quantity and quality of their labor.

When I hear that in such-and-such collective there are no fundamental changes, that there is no restructuring, there is only one thing I can say: Such enterprises should switch as quickly as possible to economic accountability—or better still, to the lease contract.

Here is an example to illustrate why I am advocating this. The Butovskiy construction materials combine in Moscow Oblast was increasing its losses from year to year. The situation deteriorated to such an extent that early this year the question of its closure arose. At that point the collective decided to lease the enterprise for a period of 8 years. A few months have passed—and I ask you to note, comrades, just a few months. And look at

the result. Output has risen by 30 percent, thanks to higher labor productivity alone. Instead of the former losses a profit of more than R500,000 was obtained and average wages have risen by R50 a month.

More than 270 Moscow Oblast enterprises and organizations in industry, construction, transport, and other sectors are currently operating under lease contracts. And there are 350 such collectives on the oblast's kolkhozes and sovkhozes.

In short, restructuring is succeeding wherever it is being taken seriously and implemented in earnest. It is bearing fruit. And vice versa: Wherever people expect someone to carry out restructuring for them, there is no improvement.

Naturally, restructuring is a difficult job which requires much effort and hard work. This is quite fair. It is impossible to expect benefits without making an effort, to expect to have them served up on a silver platter, as they say. What happened to Gogol's character Patsyuk, who only had to open his mouth and the dumplings dipped into sour cream and flew straight into it, will not happen to us.

We must all firmly grasp and understand correctly the inseparable link between people's changed living conditions and the practical work to implement restructuring. Labor is the basis of wealth. And restructuring only serves to highlight more the essence and correctness of this proposition. Only through restructuring will we achieve the implementation of our plans in the sphere of social policy, since these plans are based on radical changes in the economy and its switch from extensive to intensive development.

Here is yet another illustration of the direct link between radical changes in production and people's living standards. Sumy's Frunze machine building association—the initiator of the new principles of economic management—has been operating in accordance with these principles for 3 years. Over this period labor productivity has risen by 35 percent, profit has increased by 60 percent, and incomes have also risen according to desserts, as they say. Basic wages are more than 20 percent higher than the sector average. Last year alone more than 30,000 square meters of housing, a polyclinic, and a school were built from money earned. Many other social questions have been resolved. Now the collective is working out how to proceed further and is elaborating a proposal for switching to a lease contract.

In other words, the resolution of social problems is inconceivable without fundamental transformations in our entire national economy on the principles of radical economic reform. It is important to stress this yet again, since among some of our people there are quite strong expectations of an improvement in living conditions unconnected with an improvement in labor productivity, production growth, output quality, or the personal contribution of each individual.

And I have sensed this during my stay in Krasnoyarsk Kray. You too have such feelings. In implementing the principles of social justice, we must also in the distribution sphere firmly pursue the demand that there can be no leveling down and no parasitism in our society. These are alien to socialism and should be resolutely eradicated.

At the same time, an uncompromising struggle should be waged against all kinds of violations in the distribution of material benefits. Our public is rightly asking about the intensification of the struggle against abuse of office, corruption, bribery, pilfering, and speculation. Monitoring and law-enforcement organs are called upon to operate more resolutely and effectively in this area. The people are throwing themselves into this struggle. We must elbow these phenomena aside and eradicate them. Party and soviet organs and all leading cadres must pursue a principled line on this issue. I welcome the fact that the Krasnoyarsk party committee has now decided to investigate questions of the distribution in the kray of everything destined for the population. This is being tackled by a food commission headed by the chairman of the krayispolkom.

Talking about distribution issues, I would like to stress the need within the framework of the economic reform to make the food supply of republics, krays, and oblasts more dependent on the level of their work in agriculture. After all, comrades, a kind of original economic accountability and self-financing have now been introduced at regional level in this respect. We say: Here is your delivery target for the next 5 years. It will not increase during the 5-year plan. After fulfilling the deliveries to union and republic stocks, everything you produce is yours. And I must say that this has had a major effect on many people. Look what is happening in Volgograd Oblast. I recall how acute food supply issues were there. Now a whole range of measures has been implemented there. They cover arable farming, stockraising, new technology, and new economic management methods. In the last 3 years the growth in meat production has amounted to almost 70,000 tonnes, or 24 percent, while the growth in milk production has been 132,000 tonnes, or 18 percent. State targets for the delivery of livestock products are being exceeded. What have been the results of these efforts for the oblast? Over the last 2 years market consumption of meat has increased by 33,000 tonnes, or 40 percent, while consumption of dairy products has increased by 95,000 tonnes, or 17 percent. Pork and poultry are available in retail trade at state prices, and there are wide ranges of dairy and cookery products. Supplies of vegetables and potatoes have improved. A great contribution to this has been made by the cooperative sector and private subsidiary plots.

Similar processes are taking place in Lipetsk Oblast, too. Meat and milk deliveries for local supply have considerably increased over the last 2 years through the increase in agricultural production and the successful fulfillment of plans. Per capita consumption of these products has correspondingly increased by 9 and 32 kg respectively.

The increase in production has made it possible to seriously improve the trade in meat, dairy products, vegetables, and potatoes in Tselinograd Oblast. Livestock products have been supplied to the population of Kharkov Oblast for 2 years now without union or republic subsidy. The situation with regard to supplies of livestock products is improving in Voronezh, Tula, Tambov, Penza, Tomsk, and Kaliningrad Oblasts and Stavropol and Altay Krays. I have already talked about the achievements in Belorussia, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, and other regions. A characteristic of all these republics, krays, and oblasts is their comprehensive approach, which includes the utilization of reserves for intensifying arable farming and stockraising, and the results of contract, lease, and other economically accountable forms of activity, and the widespread introduction of the cooperative system into public and private farming on a contractual basis. A great deal in this area has also been gained through the widespread development of collective horticulture and truck farming. We have made decisions removing all restrictions in this respect.

But why are other people finding that things are going worse and are not being rectified in resolving the food issue? I think that things here are linked not just with the difficulties that kolkhozes and sovkhozes have encountered in a number of parts of the country—particularly the RSFSR's non-Chernozem Zone. After all, many oblasts where things have gone well are located in the same zones and are encountering the same difficulties. Take Orel and Kaluga Oblasts. Until recently they were in an exceptionally complex position. And yet the situation there has started changing for the better, and quite vigorously too. I am sure that in the near future substantive changes will also take place in oblasts such as Rostov, Kalinin, and other such difficult oblasts as Novgorod, Pskov, and Kirov—a great deal is being done to this end in those areas.

Nonetheless, the main thing is cadre work. I am thinking above all of cadres at kolkhozes, sovkhozes, and—to no less an extent—at party and soviet organs, their position, their attitude toward work, their concern, and, finally, their ability to assimilate new work methods.

Working people will follow and support those who are committed to their work, rely on people, consult with them, and make fair demands. Incidentally, the people really dislike weak leaders. They know that a great cause requires character, will, and ability. At the same time it is important not to offend people, to consult with them, and to be concerned about them.

During my talks I was often asked how the situation is changing for the better in labor collectives, cities, rayons, okrugs, oblasts, and krays to ensure that restructuring gathers greater momentum and is accompanied by positive changes. This is a question that was put to me at all my meetings in Krasnoyarsk Kray. My answer is this: The conditions created by the radical economic reform, democratization, and glasnost open up opportunities for resolving all existing problems, including cadre problems. So we must take advantage of these opportunities.

Comrades! Having repeatedly stressed in my speeches the ideas that the expansion of the rights of labor collectives in republics, krays, and oblasts is simultaneously accompanied by the enhancement of their responsibility for the resolution of working people's urgent problems, I must also mention something else—the intimate relationship between all components of the country's national economy, not only at sector level but at the level of labor collectives in republics, krays, and oblasts.

If there are disruptions in certain areas and certain things do not run smoothly, the country immediately feels it. I am not exaggerating. We have an integrated and very strongly linked national economic complex. Disruptions or lags in such major regions as your kray, which today occupies a key position in the country's economy, are felt all the more. One-third of all-union production of copper and nickel, a substantial amount of platinum and cobalt production, and considerable amounts of aluminum and timber production—that is, those materials without which modern scientific and technical progress and the production of the most varied output is inconceivable—are concentrated in this kray. And the most important point is that the kray is already a major power supply base and will continue to be one in the future.

The entire country has a vital interest in further boosting the kray's production potential. The fact that in the last 12 years more than R33 billion in state capital investment has been put into developing the kray's economy is directly attributable to this. The major territorial production complexes of national economic importance at Sayanskiy and Kansk-Achinsk are being set up here. The names of the cities of Divnogorsk, Lesosibirsk, Norilsk, and Sayanogorsk, which personify the work of many thousands of people who were trailblazers in the opening up of Siberia, have taken firm root in people's minds.

A great deal has been done, comrades. The working people's achievements are considerable. Today the kray has at its disposal a powerful scientific potential, a good base from which to forge ahead. Many production and scientific collectives which are well known throughout the country have been established and are working successfully on Krasnoyarsk territory. But, comrades, even your kray has not avoided negative phenomena in the economy, which has led to a substantial drop in the efficiency of the production potential created here. And what particularly worries us is the sharply manifested imbalances in the development of linked sectors, and also in the pace of development of the production sphere and the social complex. The major program for the kray's development through 1990 is basically under threat of nonfulfillment.

During these days I have heard a great deal about the food supply. The kray has great opportunities at its disposal. The proportion of arable land per inhabitant is 1.5 times higher than the average for the country.

Often when the food situation is being explained, people cite Siberia's specific features, its nature, and the climatic conditions which create difficulties. I believe that one cannot fail to take this into account. But we are talking frankly, so I shall say that the older inhabitants probably remember the Minusinsk apples, melons, tomatoes, honey, and the Siberian white bread. History has recorded this fact: Increased tariffs were set for importing Siberian grain into Russia's central regions, the impact of which began with the so-called "Chelyabinsk tariff breakthrough," for the local farmers here were quite competitive in the center of Russia. And now, it seems, you have to have duties imposed on you so that it is not shipped out. (Laughter) It is impossible to understand why with all this space you cannot satisfy city dwellers' needs, give land to all those who want it, and develop horticulture and truck farming.

First and foremost we need to sort out why the kray's economy continues to be governed by inertia, and to function primarily on an extensive basis. Scientific developments are being poorly utilized. Questions of accelerating scientific and technical progress and modernizing production, and the ecological problems which have begun to emerge in Krasnoyarsk, Norilsk, the Kansk-Achinsk complex, and other cities and villages, are not being properly resolved.

Ending this part of my statement on a positive note, I will say that it is essential to continue to formulate proposals to develop the agro-industrial complex, on which the kray party committee is working jointly with the economic aktiv, taking into consideration the discussion of these problems which took place in the scientific center. That's the first thing.

The second is the accommodation problem. In the next 3 years the construction base must be developed to such a scale that it ensures an increase in the construction of accommodation amounting to about 1 million square meters, that is, to develop it subsequently to 3 million. There are difficult ecological problems. Some of them require developments from fundamental science. But there are problems of a current nature where there are already technological and technical decisions which need to be financed. A comprehensive program for the Krasnoyarsk Kray and a concentration of local effort are needed, assistance from the center is also needed. Everything needs to be broken down into who does what and when, and then it must be done. We for our part will also provide the relevant instructions. This program is essential for Krasnoyarsk Kray, and we will examine it and take it under our control.

I would like to stress once more that what is happening in Krasnoyarsk Kray convinces me even more how vitally we all need restructuring.

I wish you success in your great work!

Comrades! I should like to touch on international affairs here in Krasnoyarsk because whatever plans for internal development we discuss they must be constantly correlated with the external conditions—both from the viewpoint of security and of economic and other ties with our neighbors near and far.

It is appropriate here at this parallel to view the situation on the Asian Continent and in the Pacific and Indian Ocean basins. A little over 2 years ago in Vladivostok we invited everyone to consider a program for the restructuring of relations among states in this gigantic and rapidly developing part of the world, whose population recently exceeded 3 billion people. This program has since been augmented and amplified on various occasions. It was further developed and given a philosophical and political basis in the Delhi Declaration which we formulated with the Indian leadership.

All this was no improvisation, comrades. We comprehensively pondered past lessons and present realities and considered the ideas and initiatives of others including, of course, the socialist countries of Asia. And when elaborating proposals acceptable to all we sought the solution in the balance of interests.

The problems of untying the knots of conflict and confrontation and the curbing of militarization have come to the fore. One of those problems is the gap between international cooperation and the rapid and unequal economic growth of some countries. The increasing of that discrepancy will inevitably present a serious challenge to the dynamic of further development, both within the framework of the region and of the whole world economy.

You can see the polarities that have emerged in this region: Japan is one thing, the Philippines another; ASEAN is one thing, Burma another, and so on. Many problems arise here which require consideration, the improvement of international relations, and their transfer to the path of collaboration and cooperation.

The opportunity to make use of the colossal potential of Asia and two great ocean basins for the purposes of general progress and peace throughout the world will be lost unless the whole range of complex problems in this vast region of the globe is thoroughly tackled now. It could even be transformed into the opposite—a source of the dangerous growth of regional and worldwide contradictions. That is why it is necessary promptly and jointly to establish rational and all-embracing cooperation here.

In brief, when formulating our Vladivostok initiative we were guided by the new thinking. Some people at that time tried to cast doubt on the sincerity and integrity of our intentions and proposals and to make it seem as though the Soviet Union was using peace-loving phrases to conceal routine expansion. There is no longer any need now to debate those views couched in the spirit of primitive anti-Sovietism: Life has simply repudiated them. Our Vladivostok initiatives have produced a great response among the region's states.

I would like to state with full responsibility once more: The Soviet Union does not seek privileges or benefits for itself to the detriment of others and does not expect advantages at the expense of others.

Yes, we care about the security of our Eastern borders—they are enormous, moreover. However, not by means of the arms race but by political and economic means and by creating a climate which removes hostility, suspicion, and mistrust. I would put it in these terms: Our policy in Asia, as everywhere, is based on the principles of freedom of choice and peaceful coexistence. It is open. There is nothing "concealed" in it.

The majority of the Asian and Pacific countries have received our policy and initiatives with great interest. There has been if not a fundamental breakthrough then a substantial improvement in the social consciousness of many countries toward the Soviet Union. From this we conclude that our thoughts and proposals have correctly captured the particular features of the situation in this region.

We note with satisfaction the increased activeness of this region's countries in world affairs, a desire for independence, and a striving to examine their problems on a bilateral or multilateral basis and to seek solutions through dialogue.

In this period our country has begun dialogue with most of the region's states, at a high level or summit level with some of them. We have established the kind of state contacts we have never had before. Through reciprocating efforts our ties have become meaningful and promising. Furthermore, all this is clearly equitable and open in character, and this fact alone contributes to the general restructuring of international relations on modern principles.

In recent years Soviet-Indian relations have been transformed into a permanent and constructive factor of tremendous international significance. The forthcoming scheduled summit in Delhi will, we expect, be a major step toward consolidating the unique friendly cooperation between two so different and influential states for the good of their own peoples and in the interests of universal security.

The political atmosphere in the Asia-Pacific region is changing. There are already quite a few specific encouraging signs. It may be said that the data bank demonstrating a desire for mutual security is becoming richer here. We believe that the Nonaligned Movement is developing in this region too. It clearly has an independent role to play in the region's destiny. It is now seeking a more effective mechanism to give great dynamism to foreign policy processes. In any event, we see a desire to participate in the solution of regional conflicts and in preventing them from occurring.

In general, comrades, I would say this: It has not been long since Vladivostok but we can see that a healthy and undoubtedly positive and highly promising process is now beginning in this vast region. This is confirmation of the growing interdependence of general human and national interests and an ever-increasing awareness of the integrated nature of the world we live in. We view our role in this realistically. But nevertheless, I believe that our contribution here is considerable, and we see how this is assessed by the peoples of all countries.

The United States has been expressing certain doubts on this score and trying to sow those doubts among the peoples and governments of the Asia-Pacific region. The states of this region have a greater understanding of the essence of our policy.

As an example I shall cite the solution of the Afghan problem. This has had a powerful influence on processes in the Asia-Pacific region and on the more objective assessment of our policy by the governments and states of this region. It is generally acknowledged that the very fact of the achievement of the Geneva accords on Afghanistan has had a favorable influence on the search for a solution to other regional conflicts.

The question of the settlement of the Cambodia situation is now making major progress as a result of efforts by that country, Vietnam, and Laos, as well as by Indonesia and the other ASEAN countries. The recent informal meeting in Jakarta, which set a highly instructive example, was an important event. The Soviet Union is ready to continue promoting the earliest achievement of agreements on Cambodia. We consider that direct talks between China and Vietnam could play an important role in the solution of that problem and the improvement of the situation in Asia as a whole.

The tragic and destructive 8-year war between Iran and Iraq has ended. The whole world community received that with a sense of relief. And I believe—not only on this occasion—that tribute should be paid to the United Nations and to the UN secretary general himself. It is noteworthy and gratifying that the United Nations is gaining strength once more and enhancing its role. We are doing everything to maintain the prestige and enhance the role of this international organization.

We hope that the processes which have now begun in the Near East will also eventually lead to the untying of this tight knot. Indeed, in the past 18 months-2 years, in the opinion of very many people in the world, the most appropriate path has been formulated—the convening of an international conference.

The situation on the Korean peninsula remains complex, even though signs of a move toward North-South dialogue have begun to emerge there, too.

As for the priority area of our foreign policy—relations with the socialist countries—here, as in Europe and with Cuba, we may note the improvement of the qualitative characteristics of our collaboration. We now have a far better view of the problems in our interrelations and the current and long-term tasks which must be resolved jointly in the interests of each country and of friendly states.

Points of contact between the Soviet Union and China are increasing during the mighty processes of renewal taking place in the two great socialist states. Very profound internal changes are taking place in these socialist states. We may note that benevolence [dobrozhelatelstvo] and trust are growing in relations between our peoples, that our profound interest in one another has been renewed and is acquiring new content, and I would say that the mutual attraction is growing. The recent bilateral working meeting in Beijing on a Cambodia settlement definitely broadened the zone of mutual understanding on this question and at the same time served to improve Soviet-Chinese relations.

We fully support the normalization of relations with the PRC and their development to a level corresponding to our two countries' responsibility for world politics. We are ready to begin preparations for a Soviet-Chinese summit without delay.

The Soviet-Australian summit was a fundamental turning point in relations with the countries of the South Pacific. By its content and its inherent political impetus it goes beyond the regional framework.

Our relations with the ASEAN countries, first and foremost Indonesia, and also with the Philippines and Malaysia, are gaining dynamism. Useful dialogue has begun with Thailand, with which we have had no relations for a long time. We support the expansion of mutually beneficial equitable relations with all states in this part of the world regardless of their size or social system.

Soviet-Japanese relations are undoubtedly of considerable significance for the whole situation here. My meetings with a number of prominent Japanese politicians—M. Ishibashi, S. Abe, T. Fuwa, and T. Doi—as well as the exchange of letters and messages with Japanese social organizations and cultural figures have made it possible to see better both the problems and the potential for overcoming stagnation.

The recent frank discussion with Yasuhiro Nakasone convinced me even more that there are grounds and mutual desire to impart dynamism to our relations on the basis of a balance of bilateral and regional interests. We hope that this positive tone will be continued during future political contacts and will enable Japanese-Soviet relations to enter the channel of normal development.

The Soviet Union has duly assessed the restoration of ties with the National Council of Governors of Japan and the renewal of its business circles' interest in their country regaining its place as one of the USSR's leading trade and economic partners. The problems existing in the humanitarian sphere and in fishing, which hinder the development of trust, are not insuperable, I believe. However, I cannot fail to note that Soviet people—as well as Japan's other neighbors near and far—are worried by the persistent buildup of its military potential within the framework of "burden sharing" with the United States.

One percent of GNP for military ends looks modest. But when you consider what it actually comprises, together with the country's growing economic might, then even 1 percent gives considerable food for thought. The Japanese appear to have demonstrated that in the modern world it is possible to achieve great-power status without relying on militarism. Naturally, the question arises: Why, then, discredit this unique experience that is so instructive for mankind? Why encumber in the people's eyes the extraordinary vigor of Japan's virtually worldwide economic presence with prewar and wartime historical associations?

We are looking hard for points of contact on the problems of the Asia-Pacific region with the United States. And we often ask the question: Why do we not have mutual understanding here, in contrast to other important spheres of world politics? Our state interests appear not to clash. We are not encroaching on the ramified U.S. economic ties. Like everywhere else, we have apparently already demonstrated that we can face up to realities. So what is the problem?

I have already said and even given a reminder, when this has been overlooked, that we are in favor of full U.S. participation in the affairs of the Asia-Pacific region, as befits its status and its political and economic potential. But it must be equal participation, without the great-power style and strong-arm methods that belong in historical dissertations.

The key to the improvement of the situation in this region, as anywhere else in the world, is reduction of tension, arms cuts, and a corresponding change in military policy. It was the treaty on intermediate- and

shorter-range missiles that helped make the first breach in military confrontation here. For Asia, where nuclear weapons have been used against civilians, this event is a special, symbolic gesture. And we are prepared to continue looking for new approaches in order to make progress in this area.

As a result of deliberation and further analysis, and seeking to advance the all-Asia security cause, the Soviet leadership is making several new proposals.

One. Aware of the Asian and Pacific Ocean countries' concern, the Soviet Union will not be increasing, as indeed has been the case for some time now, the number of any type of nuclear weapons in the region, and calls on the United States and the other nuclear powers not to site any more there.

Two. We are calling for consultations among the main naval powers of the region on the non-buildup of naval forces there.

Three. We propose a multilateral discussion of the question of reducing military confrontation in areas where the seaboards of the USSR, PRC, Japan, the DPRK, and South Korea are in proximity to one another, the aim being to freeze and commensurately reduce the levels of naval and air forces and restrict their activity.

Four. If the United States agrees to eliminate military bases in the Philippines, the USSR will be prepared, on agreement with the SRV Government, to abandon its naval material and technical supply point in Cam Ranh Bay.

Five. In the interests of secure sea and air routes in the region, we propose the joint elaboration of measures to prevent incidents in the open sea and in the airspace above it. When elaborating these measures the experience of the existing Soviet-American and Soviet-British bilateral accords and the U.S.-Soviet-Japanese trilateral accord could be utilized.

Six. An international conference on turning the Indian Ocean into a peace zone should be held not later than 1990. As is known, the bulk of the preparatory work for this has been done at the United Nations.

Seven. We propose a discussion at any level and involving any number of participants of the question of establishing a negotiating mechanism to examine our and any other proposals relating to the security of the Asia-Pacific region. The USSR, the PRC, and the United States, as permanent members of the UN Security Council, might initiate the discussion.

Some experience already exists indicating the usefulness of contacts between military representatives. Things become calmer somehow when generals and admirals look at one another not through binoculars but sit face to face at the negotiating table. They could discuss a wide range of military activity. A start could be made with a meeting of representatives of the biggest states from the military viewpoint.

It is very important for countries to know and understand one another better. Then the entirely understandable concern for their own security will be reduced. Trust and understanding will increase.

I consider it appropriate here, in Krasnoyarsk, to touch on a question on which the prospects of Soviet-American talks on reducing strategic nuclear weapons, that is, the fate of world security, depend. I am referring to the radar station not far from your city.

We have done a great deal to demonstrate that the nature and purpose of this radar station are not a breach of the 1972 ABM Treaty. We even invited U.S. congressmen here. We expressed a willingness to dismantle the station equipment if an accord could be reached on observance of the aforementioned ABM Treaty. But conjecture and speculation about the Krasnoyarsk Radar Station continue to be whipped up, and this is inhibiting the talks in Geneva. Obviously this is of benefit to someone. We have decided once and for all to take the wind out of the sails of those engaged in this and to present to those who are sincerely concerned irrefutable evidence that their doubts are groundless. We have informed the U.S. President of this decision.

We propose creating at the Krasnoyarsk Radar Station an international cooperation center for the utilization of space for peaceful purposes. And incorporate as part of it a world space organization, a concept that has been accepted by authoritative circles in the West. We are prepared to consult with scientists in all countries that show an interest in this project.

This is our response to the West's concern about the Krasnoyarsk station. But our worries about the construction of U.S. radar stations in Greenland and Britain remain. Specialists have said that they are a direct violation of the ABM Treaty. We expect Washington to adopt corresponding measures in response to our initiative.

Returning to the Asia-Pacific region, I must say that it is thoroughly polluted, and not only by armaments. There is another rapidly growing danger—environmental pollution. Everyone is well aware of this problem. And it is time to think about organizing regional cooperation in this sphere. Maybe convene, for a start, a special conference of experts which, I am convinced, would show how many common problems we have, how interrelated we all are, and therefore, that we must act together.

Such important topics as cooperation in preserving and developing national traditions and in the struggle against natural disasters also beg to be placed on the agenda.

In short, what one asks oneself is: Why not organize a meeting of foreign ministers of all interested states (or those who want one) to discuss the initial approaches to the building of new relations in the Asia-Pacific basin.

We observed with interest the activity of the conference on Asia-Pacific economic cooperation and welcomed its recent session in Osaka, and we are prepared to join in this international organization's work in any form its members consider acceptable. The various UN organizations—the Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific and the Economic and Social Commission for Western Asia—need to be more active.

I would not want to give the impression that everything is fine with us as far as implementation of the Vladivostok ideas is concerned; that external circumstances have been the only problem. Far from it. And this stems from from what I was talking about in the first part of my speech—our problems and difficulties. But we are looking a long way ahead. The radical economic reform and restructuring of the political system will ensure the mighty modern development of Siberia and the Far East, worthy of these great and promising parts of our homeland. This will make it possible—if our neighbors and more remote states so wish—to jointly weave not only a strong but also a beautiful fabric of economic, scientific-technical, cultural, ecological, and other ties in this part of Asia. We consider that the potential of the Valdivostok program is far from exhausted.

In order to dynamize foreign economic ties, and in view of the specific features of these parts of our country, we are currently working on measures which could be called a "preferential arrangement."

We intend:

—to grant enterprises, organizations, and production cooperatives here the right of direct access to the foreign market;

—to introduce a "Far East differential"—the right to use part of the currency deductions for the collectives' social development needs, including the purchase of consumer goods abroad;

—to give enterprises participating in coastal and border trade the opportunity to use for export all the raw materials and supplies they have saved;

—to allow our enterprises access to direct outside ties, while cooperatives would receive authorization to do this from krayispolkoms and oblispolkoms;

—to exempt joint enterprises set up on contract terms from profit tax for a longer period than applies in other parts of the country, and also make their reinvestments in social development funds exempt from tax;

—to establish pay at joint enterprises at the discretion of the management and trade unions.

We are also thinking of creating special "joint enterprise zones" in the Far East which would operate a preferential system of customs duty, licensing of foreign economic deals, and taxation, and where there would be a reduced payment for natural and labor resources.

We would expand the role of local organs of power in the management of foreign economic activity. Local organs of power would keep part of the Far East exporter-enterprises' currency deductions. Clearly, the creation of a regional body in the Far East to coordinate foreign economic ties is overdue.

The Soviet Union took notice of an item in the Chinese press about the potential for developing Chinese-Japanese-Soviet tripartite economic activity on mutually advantageous terms. We share this approach. And if all the sides are willing, these ideas could be put on a practical footing.

One might add to this the fact that we are prepared to reach an accord on organizing joint agricultural production with the Chinese side in Amur and Chita Oblasts, and participation in the constructution of civilian facilities there on a reciprocal basis.

I believe that in the context of a general improvement in the situation on the Korean peninsula opportunities may arise for organizing economic ties with South Korea.

I am sure that the progress of multifaceted forms of cooperation new to us will also create the material and psychological basis for the development of mass foreign tourism.

We are in favor of the bolder involvement of people's diplomacy, which has already demonstrated its activity [as published] in day-to-day life, and of increased contacts between people. In this connection, why not consider creating a regional center for cultural contacts among peoples for the Asia-Pacific region? The purpose of this public organization with national departments would be to elaborate projects in various areas of knowledge and activity and promote contacts between academics, students, and ordinary citizens from different countries, and joint humanitarian and ecological research.

Dear comrades, we are only at the start of the road to the future of the great Asia-Pacific region of the world. Much needs to be done. We can expect difficulties, obstacles, and extraordinary new developments. But we will move forward doggedly, step by step, accumulating experience and skills. It is all worth it.

The world's every morning begins in the East, born, figuratively speaking, in the waves of a Pacific Ocean which is not so distant from you, particularly when Siberian criteria are employed, and I have obtained some impression of these in my flights across Krasnoyarsk Kray.

Let us work so that each day takes us further along the road of the successful solution of the tasks of restructuring, toward the strengthening of peace and trust among the peoples!

Armenian Ministry Issues Statement on Clashes

Calls for Self-Restraint

NC1909165988 [Editorial Report] Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian at 1625 GMT on 19 September, during its scheduled newscast, carries an approximately 2-minute statement issued by the Armenian SSR Ministry of Interior on clashes between Azeris and Armenians in Stepanakert and Khodzheyli, following a meeting in Stepanakert. The statement says that (?25 people, 15 of whom) were Armenians, were wounded and that (?19) have been hospitalized. The statement adds that officials from the USSR Prosecutor General's Office and from the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs have been sent to the region. The statement says that the Armenian SSR leadership is in constant contact with USSR special envoy to Stepanakert Volskiy and concludes by calling on the people to show self-restraint.

Troops Reportedly Flown In

AU2009070088 Paris AFP in English 2245 GMT 19 Sep 88

[Sophie Shahib report]

[Text] Moscow, Sept 20 (AFP)—Soviet military planes have begun ferrying troop reinforcements to the Armenian capital Yerevan which has been paralysed by massive strikes and protests after weekend violence, Armenian sources said.

A 61-year-old man died on Monday after being shot in weekend clashes between Armenians and Azeris over demands for the transfer of the Armenian-majority enclave of Nagorno-Karabakh from Azerbaijan republic to the neighbouring republic of Armenia, an Armenian leader told AGENCE FRANCE-PRESSE by telephone.

The Armenian leader, Ambartsum Galastyan, a member of the banned Karabakh committee which spearheads the campaign for the territorial transfer, said two other people were seriously hurt.

Officials admitted 25 people were hurt in the clashes, adding that 17 were taken to hospital, some with bullet wounds.

Military aircraft began landing at Yerevan before midnight local time and were continuing to arrive every 10 minutes, according to Mr. Galastyan and other residents.

Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev sent a personal message to the Karabakh committee on Monday, via Armenian party leader Suren Arutyunyan, urging members to calm their supporters, Mr. Galastyan said.

Members had demanded "guarantees" before appealing to the people, Mr. Galastyan said, otherwise Armenians would not listen to them.

Some 250,000 people had gathered outside the Armenian parliament in Yerevan calling for an emergency session Tuesday to reconsider transferring the Azerbaijani-administered enclave to Armenia.

Calls to pursue the strike Tuesday were heard. Virtually everything halted in Yerevan Monday and the strike was reportedly spreading to other Armenian towns.

The official news agency TASS had earlier reported the Nagorno violence for the first time in a bulletin read on Soviet television. TASS said all gatherings had been banned.

Mr. Arutyunyan proposed to speed up the search for a solution through a meeting Tuesday or Wednesday of the presidium of the Armenian parliament, which could refer the matter to the national presidium. But the national body in July had refused any boundary changes despite widescale protests.

Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Gennadiy Gerasimov had earlier said the situation in Stepanakert, the main town of Nagorno-Karabakh was "very tense", but declined to comment further.

Phone lines were cut on Monday between Moscow and Nagorno-Karabakh.

Mr. Galastyan said troops had surrounded Stepanakert, adding that he expected the Army to send reinforcements into the region.

The clashes in Nagorno-Karabakh came after a strike during most of last week by Armenians in Stepanakert, who had also demanded the evacuation of some 2,000 Azeri refugees who fled into Nagorno-Karabakh from Armenia after earlier ethnic unrest.

Rioting and ethnic violence have cost at least 33 lives since the traditionally Christian Armenians stepped up their campaign for the transfer of Nagorno-Karabakh in February, against opposition from Azeris, who are mostly Shi'ite Moslems.

A total of 32 people, mostly Armenians, were killed by rioting Azeris, according to an official toll, in the Azerbaijani city of Sumgait at the end of February. An Armenian youth was shot dead at Yerevan airport after troops broke up a mass protest there on July 5.

Armenian Plenum on 'Stagnation,' Changes

PM2009081588 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Sep 88 Second Edition p 2

[Report by PRAVDA special correspondent G. Ovcharenko: "Overcoming Stagnation. From the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee Plenum"]

[Text] Yerevan—This plenum that was held, as has been reported already in PRAVDA, on Tuesday in Yerevan, was not like those that took place here even a year ago. It is not only a matter of the scale and acuteness of the question put forward for discussion by the Communists: party organizations' tasks to overcome stagnation phenomena in the economy and social sphere and improve the ideological and moral situation in the republic.

"I think it is the first plenum I can remember," said S. Petrosyan, member of the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee Bureau and leader of an instrument control team at the "Nairit" Association as he shared his impressions, "which was prepared in accordance with glasnost and democracy, with the participation of a wide range of Communists. So what one heard expressed openly at the plenum was, I would say, the voice of the people, their wishes...."

In recent years the writer of these lines has been to Armenia on several occasions and met with both ordinary working people and the republic's leaders. I also remember the arrogant K. Demirchyan, former Armenian Communist Party Central Committee first secretary, who was sure of himself and of his immovability. He would treat any remark about the republic, but particularly about him, as an insult, and he claimed that under his leadership restructuring had begun earlier in the Armenian SSR than anywhere else in the country. He and his intimates did not see or did not want to see that the crisis situation which has now become an agonizing reality for the Armenian people, as the plenum noted, was already in the making.

Nor was the Armenian leadership cowed by the criticism voiced at the CPSU Central Committee June (1987) Plenum: "There is a totally unwarranted serenity in the republic, the proper exactingness toward cadres is lacking, and an effective struggle is not being waged against bribery, speculation, and favoritism. The Armenian Communist Party Central Committee must thoroughly analyze the state of affairs in the party organization and in the republic as a whole, examine it from principled positions, and engage in restructuring not in words but in deeds."

This alarm signal was muffled by the fanfares of imaginary well-being and prosperity. They provided the accompaniment as the economy continued to lag behind and an intolerable situation took shape in housing, trade, medical, consumer, and municipal services, and the provision of food, goods, and services. Ecological problems got worse.

These are facts cited by S. Arutyunyan, Armenian Communist Party Central Committee first secretary, in his report at the plenum. The average annual growth rates of national income and labor productivity have dropped 2.4 and 2.1 times, respectively, in the current 5-year plan as compared with the last. Plans for the production of nearly one-half of the 65 most important types of industrial products are not being fulfilled. The republic is now at the bottom of the nationwide league in terms of contract supplies. In the last 2 years losses in industry as a result of defective products have been up 27 percent on the average for the years of the 11th 5-Year Plan. In 1985-1987 alone the annual economic saving as a result of the introduction of new technology was reduced by R13 million, while expenditure on this increased by R238 million. In the 10th and 11th 5-Year Plans capital investments totaling around R440 million were not assimilated. Approximately 18 percent of the able-bodied population is not engaged in social production, which is 50 percent above the average union level.

Some 74 industrial associations and enterprises, 96 construction organizations, 170 kolkhozes and sovkhozes, and a number of transport, supply, and trade organizations in the republic ended last year making a loss. In the national economy as a whole Armenia owes suppliers and banks over R600 million. In terms of the production of foodstuffs the republic is 1.8 times below the average union level; two-thirds of milk requirements and over 40 percent of its meat requirements are met by subsidies from all-union stocks. In the past 10 years thefts of socialist property have increased approximately six times over and a "gray" economy has developed.

All this has systematically undermined the moral foundations and has had a baneful effect on the republic's moral climate, causing social apathy, an erosion of leading cadres' authority, and distrust of official utterances.

Of course, there were people who saw and recognized that there were irregularities in the life of the party; that posts in the economy and party were being doled out according to the principles of personal dedication to superiors, clannishness, and favoritism, rather than on professional merit; that figure padding and window dressing were rife, laws were being broken, and social justice was being infringed. But they were not heeded, they were kept out in the cold.

The Armenian Communist Party Central Committee plenum cleared up many matters. S. Nazinyan, first secretary of Krasnoselskiy party raykom, reported that over a period of 7 years he had made 21 requests to speak

at plenums or party aktiv meetings in order to talk about instances of window dressing and figure padding, but only now had he been allowed to speak. The recent past and the current situation were assessed from principled positions by P. Arakelyan, milkmaid at the Loriyskiy pedigree livestock farm in Kalininskiy Rayon; B. Mkrtchyan, editor of the republican newspaper KOMMUNIST; Yu. Chshmarityan, first secretary of Stepanavanskiy party raykom, and many others. The report and the speeches cited specific instances of the degeneration of certain party, soviet, and economic leaders and law enforcement personnel. The logical extension of this was proposals by a number of speakers on convening next year a republican party conference or extraordinary Armenian Communist Party congress, which, in particular, would have to review the membership of the Central Committee and rid it of unenterprising people and people who have compromised themselves.

The carefully concealed stagnation in the republic's economy and public life, the ever-widening gulf between word and action, and the neglect of ordinary people's interests inevitably eroded the authority of the republic's party organization. Many party, soviet, and economic leaders were bankrupt. Party committees and the Central Committee were shown to be out of touch with the broad masses of working people.

All this was discussed at the plenum. And I confess that not only I, but, as it turned out in conversations after the session, others were asking the question: Isn't the plenum paying too much attention to the past? But we came to the common conclusion: There is no other way! What is needed is a clear-cut analysis of the mistakes and errors that have been committed and an awareness of the causes. In order to make negative phenomena a thing of the past, in order, as S. Arutyunyan said in his report, to have a direct dialogue with people and unite around the party all those who are willing to actually carry out restructuring in the republic rather than just talk about it, it is necessary to give people the truth, call a spade a spade, and express opinions openly.

Incidentally, Suren Gurgenovich has a moral right to speak thus, to severely criticize the previous leadership. Above all because before, when he was first deputy chairman of the Armenian SSR Council of Ministers, he was among the few who openly criticized the Central Committee Bureau's stance and the former first secretary at the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee July (1987) plenum and called for an overhaul [ozdorovleniye] of the ranks of the republican party organization, for glasnost and democracy.

The first steps on that road have now been taken. The Armenian Communist Party Central Committee abandoned the secretive approach and, a month before the plenum, urged Communists and all working people to make constructive proposals and criticial observations on all matters of party, economic, and social life.

People responded to the call for a direct and honest discussion about what is inhibiting restructuring and impeding the quest for the best solutions, the enrichment of party organizations' ideological life, and the restoration of social justice. There were over 2,500 proposals and observations. Specialists, academics, party workers, and representatives of the creative intelligentsia were enlisted to analyze them. On the initiative of the Central Committee General Department the most important and topical letters were published in republican newspapers and leading workers of the Central Committee and ministries and departments appeared on television to answer questions raised in them. The republic spent a month preocuppied with the upcoming plenum and it can now be said that it was successful. Successful primarily because the tone had been set before the session by the broadest strata of the population who demanded an uncompromising analysis of the situation, concrete measures to overcome stagnation phenomena, and the identification of priority areas in the republican party organization's policy.

The plenum carried out this mandate. In a newspaper report it is impossible to give a full account of the program outlined by the Communists to overcome the negative phenomena, but I will name the main ingredients. They are the transfer of the economy to an intensification footing through the introduction of scientific-technical achievements, the course of fully supplying the population with food, commodities, housing, and services, a return to Lenin's cadre policy, and, above all, the restoration of social justice.

The report and the speeches at a plenum geared to criticism contained virtually no positive examples and did not mention what the republic's party organization and the new Central Committee first secretary have managed to accomplish in a few months. I believe this is not really the correct approach. In the first place because the emerging experience of good work is a fine example amd a stimulus to the activation of restructuring and, in the second place, a great deal has indeed been done. The main thing is that the moral and psychological atmosphere in the republic is changing for the better.

People have started to express their thoughts freely and honestly and to call a spade and spade. They feel their opinions are being listened to and their social activeness can serve the cause of restructuring. There is now experience, albeit as yet small, of the democratic election of leaders of enterprises and organizations and raykom secretaries. For instance, the nomenklatura circle was broken and qualified economist and expert statistician L. Davtyan was nominated as chairman of the State Committee for Statistics and, at the plenum, Academician G. Galoyan, Armenian SSR Academy of Sciences vice president, to the Central Committee for ideology. The first steps have been taken to restore social justice. For example, the notorious government dachas, guest

houses, and reception premises were handed over to the ministries of health and social security. Changes for the better are taking place and they must be supported and developed.

"Today's plenum," P. Afrikyan, member of the Armenian Communist Central Committee and tool-making team leader, said on the rostrum, "will be of crucial significance for the republic and for all of us."

Moldavia Adopts Decree on Demonstrations

LD2009093488 Kishinev SOVETSKAYA MOLDAVIYA in Russian 4 Aug 88 p 1

[Excerpts] On 2 August 1988 the Moldavian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium adopted a decree "On Responsibility for Breaches of Established Procedure for Organizing and Holding Gatherings, Meetings, Street Marches, and Demonstrations" in order to safeguard public order and to protect the rights and interests of citizens during mass meetings.

It has been established that breaches of the procedure for organizing or holding gatherings, meetings, street marches, and demonstrations will entail administrative responsibility in the form of a warning or the imposition of a fine of up to R300 and, in exceptional circumstances, if in the circumstances and depending on the character of the person responsible for the breach these measures are acknowledged to be insufficient, administrative arrest for up to 15 days.

If (after the administrative penalty measures have been imposed) the same offense is committed a second time within a year by the organizer of a gathering, meeting, street march, or demonstration, the punishment will be a fine of up to R1,000, corrective work for between 1 and 2 months with 20 per cent reduction in earnings, or administrative arrest for up to 15 days.

A breach of procedure for organizing or holding gatherings, meetings, street marches, and demonstrations by the organizer of the gathering, meeting, street march, or demonstration after the administrative penalty measures have been imposed for such activities will entail criminal responsibility and will be punished by a fine of up to R2,000, by corrective work for up to a year, or deprivation of liberty for up to 6 months. [passage omitted]

The decree came into force on the day it was adopted.

Role of Lithuanian Foreign Ministry Examined

LD1509202288 Vilnius in Lithuanian to North America 0000 GMT 10 Sep 88

[Excerpts] While implementing further democratization of the state and political reforms, it is inevitable that we should arrive at the issue of foreign policy.

Independent foreign policy on issues which solely concern Lithuania are guaranteed by our Constitution. However, this right is not being put into practice.

Ilona Rukiene, a Vilnius radio journalist, talks to Rimgaudas Malisauskas, deputy foreign minister, about the work of the Lithuanian SSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

[Begin recording] [Rukiene] The foreign policy of any country is closely linked with its domestic policies. [Words indistinct] when Lithuania joined the USSR in 1940, it had its own Ministry of Foreign Affairs with all functions which are characteristic of such an institution. During the Stalin era, these functions had been gradually dropped by Lithuania and were taken over by Moscow.

So, why does the republic need a Ministry of Foreign Affairs?

[Malisauskas] Your remark is on the mark. Our foreign policy has become the prerogative of the all-union government. However, we issue diplomatic and official passports for those who travel abroad; there is a large scope of consulate work, including corresponding with consulates and embassies abroad. [passage omitted]

However, this is not the most important thing. [Words indistinct] Lithuania is not a member of the United Nations. As you know, at the end of the Second World War the Soviet Government proposed to make union republics members of the UN. However, the Western states were against it.

[Rukiene] The participation of Lithuania in the UN depends on Lithuania's international status. Most of the Western states do not recognize Lithuania's joining the USSR.

[Malisauskas] The arguments were as follows: The UN was being set up at the end of World War II, and at that time it was comprised of only 50 states. The Western states did not want the Eastern Bloc, the socialist countries, to have the majority, the majority of votes. And now times are different and the UN comprises more than one hundred states.

[Rukiene] The self-financing of Lithuania is currently being discussed. When the republic acquires financial autonomy, then the question of links with abroad becomes especially important. Are the activities of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs going to change?

[Malisauskas] Yes, there is no doubt about it. If the Republic wins such rights, then the scope of activity of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs will be altered. [passage omitted]

[Rukiene] Your responses demonstrate that you are a professional diplomat. Your career as a diplomat at one time was disrupted. Can you tell us about it?

[Malisauskas] I began my diplomatic service in 1973 at the Soviet Embassy in Washington, where I stayed for 5 and ½ years. Seven years later, I went to Washington for my second term. Unfortunately, I became involved in the U.S.-USSR "diplomatic face-slapping." It started from a simple issue and expanded to involve a large group of Soviet and American diplomats who threw accusations at innocent people. [passage omitted] [end recording]

Turkmen Plenum, Food Supply Problems Viewed
PM1609161988 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 14 Sep 88 p 3

[SELSKAYA ZHIZN correspondent G. Kolodin: "The Speaker Set the Tone.... Notes From Turkmen Communist Party Central Committee Plenum"]

[Text] The plenum in question was the first held by the republic's party organization since the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference. It is quite natural to want to regard its work in the light, as it were, of the recent forum of the country's Communists. The summer of 1988 roused the country and convinced many doubters that restructuring is in earnest and that there can be no return to the past.

The republic's party organization has done a great deal recently to improve the situation and really address working people's problems. But the changes could have been weightier, restructuring is often marking time, and the ailments of the years of stagnation are making themselves felt. The Central Committee plenum that discussed the question of reinforcing the organizational and political work of the republic's party organization to improve the population's food supply in light of the demands of the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference and the CPSU Central Committee July (1988) Plenum also confirmed this.

Only a few minutes of the report by S.A. Niyazov, first secretary of the Turkmen Communist Party Central Committee, were devoted to what had been achieved since the beginning of the 5-year plan. In comparison with the 11th 5-Year Plan, the production of grain, vegetables and cucurbits, meat (slaughter weight) and milk has increased by 17, 19, and 15 percent respectively. For the first time in a long period labor productivity has risen—by 10.7 percent. All this is the result of an increase in people's civic and labor activeness and the work being carried out in the republic to strengthen party and state discipline, boost cadre responsibility, cleanse the moral atmosphere, and introduce progressive forms of labor organization and remuneration.

A preliminary analysis illustrates that the agricultural year drawing to a close will reinforce the economy of livestock units and rayons and will make it possible to attain higher targets in the population's food supply. A gratifying fact—and this was also mentioned at the plenum. But today it is not enough to confine ourselves solely to successful percentages in comparison with the recent years of stagnation. That is why the report acutely raised the question of how far the level that has been attained corresponds with the republic's capabilities and the demands of the day. The answer is, alas, depressing. As yet, only positive changes have taken shape rather than a radical turnaround to intensive methods of economic activity. This has resulted in the republic lagging substantially behind mean union indicators for average per capita food consumption. It is especially surprising that in a republic that is the largest producer of vegetables the demand for this type of output per inhabitant is 37 kg less than the national average.

There is no need to brood too long over reports and information in order to conclude how far the course of implementing the Food Program in a particular region accords with the requirements of the day. It's enough to walk around the stores and markets: Then you get the real picture. Obviously, guided by these principles, the speaker also incorporated the following item into his personal plan of preparations for the plenum: a visit to trading points. It must be said that Ashkhabad's stores are well-stocked with meat, butter, and sausage. One-third of this output, however, is brought in from outside the republic. Furthermore, the situation is much worse in other cities, not to mention settlements and auls. Food products are in short supply and sharp traders skillfully take advantage of the situation: Customers complain about goods being held back and then sold under-the-counter at speculative prices. Local cooperative workers from numerous cafes and kabob houses organized an extremely efficient criminal "technological" chain from stores' back room meat departments. So meat obtained at state prices is sold at treble the price, at cooperative prices. It is not surprising that literally on the eve of the plenum the Central Committee Bureau recommended relieving A. Yazlakov, the republic's minister of trade, of his post, for shortcomings in his work.

It is undoubtedly important to restore order in food distribution. However, until the food shortage is eliminated abuses are possible and even inevitable. The plenum analyzed clearly the omissions impeding the creation of a reliable food supply for working people.

The example of Tashauz Oblast is typical. In the scramble for gross cotton output it was forgotten here that people need meat, milk, and vegetables every day. In this situation people were in no mood to show concern for the land or for any system for resolving pressing tasks of land reclamation and the ecological situation. As a result of this disregard for elementary agrotechnical needs there was a sharp decrease in the yield from irrigated hectares. For instance, in Oktyabrskiy Rayon 20 quintals of meat and 56 quintals of milk are produced per 100 hectares of irrigated arable land. The situation in other rayons in the oblast is little better. It was surprising that on taking the rostrum O. Khodzhakov, secretary of a Turkmen Communist Party obkom, noted impassively the prevailing situation—in effect, a crisis situation—with regard to the resolution of the food problem.

Incidentally, while listening to the speakers at the plenum I involuntarily recalled the unpleasant memory of the years when people apparently were uncommonly adept at making a formality out of any—even the best, it would seem—undertaking. That is also happening with the spread of the family, lease, and other types of contract: From the rostrum speakers extolled the contract and cited clear figures for how many peasants were involved in them and the indicators achieved by the pacesetters. As if there were no problems attached to this most important business. However, when you visit livestock units you see for yourself that the contract—especially the lease contract—is proceeding in a creaky fashion and leaders and specialists have a poor understanding of the niceties of the matter and often stubbornly sabotage anything new for fear of losing their administrative power over their subordinates. There is even the opinion that introducing the contract in a republic with a surplus able-bodied population will invariably end up in mass unemployment. Yet another argument "against" is that the contract in Turkmen conditions, apart from positive elements, also has an undesirable element—that of covert exploitation of child labor. This refers to the fact that in the rush for profits some families take on large areas of cotton for cultivation, drag children away from their studies, and wear them out in the fields. Many questions of this sort crop up among peasants. This is the most extensive field of activity for party leaders and the ideological aktiv. N. Selimov, first secretary of Kizyl-Arvatskiy party raykom, is right when he says that the most important party work now is linked with introducing the contract, and primarily the lease contract. But neither he nor any other plenum participant would go any further than this just assertion.

At the plenum people voiced a call to smash the old views and outmoded methods of economic activity and management structures and replace them with new ones—the development of agro-industrial integration and the various forms of cooperation. However, judging by the speech made by Yu.K. Mogilevets, first deputy chairman of the Turkmen SSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the republic's agro-industrial complex, Turkmenistan has decided not to relinquish its customary place among the most inefficient and backward as regards setting up associations like Tula's "Novomoskovskoye" Association. This stance somehow does not tally with the conference decisions.

Meanwhile the situation with, for instance, vegetable production, storage, and processing requires that everyone involved in this pool their efforts. Not only have the last 2 years' production plans not been fulfilled, the return from the vegetable hectare is low.

Take vegetable processing. Up to 70 percent of canned vegetables are brought into the southern republic from outside, yet scarcely half its capacities are being used. Is this acting in a careful, proprietorial fashion?

I asked many people in the Turkmen capital the following question: What is the food product in shortest supply for the people of Ashkhabad? The answer was immediate: "potatoes." In fact, at the September bazaar, itinerant traders charged prices of R1-1.5 for the so-called "second bread." Yes, and cooperative workers take 90 kopecks for 1 kg of tubers of dubious appearance and quality. Is the republic's agro-industrial complex really not capable of resolving the potato supply problem?

The state of livestock farming was analyzed in detail at the plenum. Production volumes for meat and milk by no means meet the population's requirements. More than 30 percent of livestock unit output—as has already been said—is imported into the republic; there are possibilities in the next few years of achieving self-sufficiency for meat and milk output. But for this it is necessary to effect a resolute change in the attitude toward the sector as being of secondary, incidental interest for the majority of farms specializing in cotton.

Unfortunately, once again the plenum fragmented, as it were, into two by no means equal parts. The plenum participants listened very attentively and I would even say very intensely to the well-argued, emotional speech by S.A. Niyazov. But then the speakers went up to the rostrum one by one and the auditorium became more indifferent: Newspapers began to rustle and people began to nod off. Attempts were made from the presidium to divert the speakers onto a keen, topical discussion, but many people's customary predilection for pre-prepared speeches—personal reports finishing with requests addressed to higher-ranking organizations and assurances that "all efforts would be made"—was too strong. Whereas D. Nyryagdyyev, a shepherd from Kizyl-Atreksiy Rayon's Lenin Kolkhoz, can be forgiven this, it was clearly unseemly for Ch. Gedzhenov, a recent delegate to the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference and first secretary of Mary Turkmen Communist Party Obkom, to read out loud but empty phrases from a previously prepared text that would not even have passed muster for a speaker at a rayon rostrum, not to mention a republic one.

Let me make one frankly alarming observation in conclusion. Exactly 1 year ago the problems of the agro-industrial complex were discussed in detail at a republic meeting of the party-economic aktiv. I compared its materials with the plenum transcript. The former contained an equally sharp report touching on the sore points of the agro-industrial complex. But the list of speakers in the debates was almost the same as those at the plenum. The same cheerful promises from party and economic workers to rectify matters, the same requests to higher-ranking organs, and extensive, previously drafted resolutions.

I would like the analogy to end here. Then in 1 year we could say that the plenum's decisions had not remained merely empty paper promises which, as is well known, will not feed the people.

Ecological Service in Ukraine Reorganized

AU1909152988 Kiev PRAVDA UKRAINY in Russian 15 Sep 88 p 1

["A Decree of the Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium"]

[Text] The Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium resolves to form, on the basis of the Ukrainian SSR Republic State Committee for the Protection of Nature and appropriate ministerial and departmental subunits exerting state control and administration in the field of protecting the environment and utilizing natural resources on the territory of the Ukrainian SSR, which are to be abolished, the Ukrainian SSR Union-Republic State Committee for the Protection of Nature.

[Signed] V. Shevchenko, chairman, and N. Khmenko, secretary of the Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium

City of Kiev, 14 September 1988

Cuts, Reorganization in Ukrainian Administration

AU1309155188 [Editorial Report] Kiev PRAVDA UKRAINY in Russian on 7 September carries in its "Announcements" column on page 4 the following notices:

"The republic-level 'Ukrkhudozhprom' Industrial Association under the Ukrainian SSR Ministry of Local Industry is to be abolished.

"The creditors may present their claims within one month of the appearance of this publication.

"The address is: 252112 Kiev, Vorovskogo Street 22. Telephone: 216-37-97."

"The republic-level 'Ukrgaz' Association for gas supplies and gasification is to be abolished on 1 October.

"Claims will be accepted until 25 September.

"The address is: 252112 Kiev, Gonty Street 3-A."

"The Ukrainian SSR Ministry of the Construction Materials Industry gives notification of the abolition of the following subordinate organizations:

"The republic-level industrial association for the cement and asbestos-cement industry;

"The republic-level industrial association for wall materials;

"The republic-level industrial association for nonmetalliferous construction materials;

"The republic-level industrial association for polymer and roofing materials;

"The republic-level industrial association for the ceramic industry;

"The republic-level industrial association for sanitary engineering equipment;

"The 'Ukrstromkomplekt' trust for the procurement of equipment;

"The republic-level 'Ukrstromsyrye' administration for the supply of raw mineral materials and for marketing local construction materials.

"Claims to the aforementioned organizations will be accepted until 1 November.

"The address is: 252001 Kiev, Kreshchatik 5. Telephone: 228-17-96.

[Signed] "The liquidation commission."

Ukrainian Area Radiation Data Published

AU1909154188 Kiev PRAVDA UKRAINY in Russian 16 Sep 88 p 3

[Unattributed report: "On Radiation Conditions"]

[Text] The Ukrainian Republic Hydrometeorological Administration has noted that the radiation background in Kiev amounts to 0.015-0.022 milliroentgen, in Zhitomir to 0.012 milliroentgen, and in Chernigov to 0.013 milliroentgen.

TRUD Article Assails Ukrainian Nationalists

PM1609111588 Moscow TRUD in Russian 15 Sep 88 p 4

[Special Correspondent V. Galenkin article under the rubric "Warning: Subversion!": "The Specters of Zeppelinstrasse"]

[Text] Kiev—All the documents, names, and facts which are going to be cited in our article are genuine. They were read out at a news conference in Kiev on 14 September 1988.

It took years of selfless work to secure that information. The people entrusted with that work had to combat an enemy prepared to commit any crime. One doesn't usually name such people. They do their difficult job and remain in the shadows. But today we are going to name the people who fought this silent battle for 20 years.

And so, to the first document. It is dated 1941....

"To His Excellency the Fuehrer and Reichskanzler, Berlin.

"Your Excellency!

"We are full of sincere gratitude to and admiration for your valiant army, which has covered itself with new glory on the battlefield against Europe's greatest enemy, Moscow Bolshevism, and we convey to you, the greatest Fuehrer, the sincere wish of the Ukrainian people and their government in liberated Lemberg that the struggle be crowned with the final victory.

"On behalf of the Ukrainian Government, Yaroslav Stetsko, head."

Thus, oozing unctuousness, the Bandera leaders groveled before Hitler for scraps from the fascist table.

In addition to the groveling there was also the "cause." The "Nachtigall" and "Roland" punitive battalions, formed from Bandera's people, drenched the Ukraine in blood. They took part in mass shootings and torture of the civilian population, in the struggle against the partisans and the underground movement, and in shipping young Ukrainian men and women off to forced labor in Germany.

Who were they, these monsters, who sold themselves to the fascists for Judas' 30 pieces of silver and whom the people dubbed "Hitler's scum"? Where were they from, what was their aim?

In 1930 extremist emigres set up the "Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists," or OUN for short. Immediately after its "birth" it was adopted by the fascists. On the eve of the attack on the Soviet Union spies and saboteurs were recruited from its ranks on the orders of the Abwehr—German military intelligence—and sent to our country. After the occupation of the Ukraine punitive units were formed from those nationalists known as Bandera's people (after the OUN's first leader, Stepan Bandera).

Actively collaborating with Hitler's men, the OUN pursued a definite aim—the creation of an "independent Ukrainian synodic power"—a state modeled on fascist Germany. In the process it was planned to annihilate not only communists and Jews but all dissident Ukrainians. In the process the ELIMINATION OF TWO-THIRDS OF THE POPULATION was to be "allowed for"...

It did not happen! Fearing retribution for their crimes, a section of OUN ringleaders fled with the retreating fascists to the West where, in 1945, they created the so-called "Units Abroad" (OUN UA). Rank-and-file OUN members took to their hideouts, the so-called skhrony, in the forests. For a long time even after the USSR's victory over fascist Germany they continued to terrorize the population of the Western Ukraine until they were routed.

Yes, the traitors skulking in their skhrony are no more. But there are sinister specters around.

In Munich there is a building, indistinguishable from the hundreds or thousands like it, which houses an office. Typewriters clatter and anxious-faced people hurry along the corridors. Stop! These are not people dashing along the corridors, not people conferring behind closed doors, not people writing circulars and information sheets. These are specters, the successors to those traitors who both during and after the war killed, burned, and raped the "dear mother Ukraine." Here, at 67 Zeppelinstrasse, is the headquarters of the OUN UA.

"Bandera and Stetsko concluded a special agreement with the British under which they pledged to supply British intelligence with information on the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. The British pay OUN for this. As for U.S. military and political intelligence, they want to use the Ukrainian nationalist formations abroad and recruit agents from among them whom they send into the USSR and other socialist countries"—that was the testimony on the postwar activity of the OUN UA by one of that organization's ringleaders who unexpectedly found himself in the building on Dzerzhinskiy Square.

Neither Bandera nor Stetsko is with us today—they have departed this life. The OUN UA are now headed by their successor—Vasiliy Oleskiv and "company." True, the ringleader himself and his "company" are no different from their predecessors. You can tell that from their career records.

Vasiliy Oleskiv, the present leader of the OUN UA, hails from Ternopol Oblast and fled to the West in 1944 with the remnants of the SS Galizien Division, which is remembered in the Ukraine to this day for its particular atrocities.

Then there is Security Service (SD) consultant Ivan Kashuba, a paid agent of the Abwehr who has cooperated closely with NATO's special services.

There is one more character in this company—Ilya Dmitriv—Kashuba's henchman in his bloody deeds. He works as an agent against the USSR and the socialist community countries and organizes illegal channels for infiltrating the Ukraine.

V. Mazur...T. Buynyak...S. Mudrik...Ye. Koval...The list could go on...

Recently Vasiliy Oleskiv gave a pathetic salute and said: "The liberation of the Ukraine now demands the mobilization of all the people's forces and, during the armed struggle, large casualties on the battlefield as well."

The CIA has made endless funds available to the OUN UA. That money has been used in the United States and other Western countries to set up military camps where young Ukrainian nationalists are given military training and prepare to become the assassins of their people.

These camps have everything needed to become a professional killer: shooting training using all kinds of weapons, practice in operating combat hardware, terror methods, radio operation....

The specters from Zeppelinstrasse, as everyone knows, can neither plow nor sow but they have healthy appetites. The OUN UA contentedly consume dollars, pounds, and marks. But these foreign currency handouts have to be repaid in kind. On the orders of the special services the units have begun more persistent attempts to conduct subversive activity on Ukrainian territory itself.

In the late sixties Ilya Dmitriv-Rubizhnyy, a ringleader of the OUN UA, recruited Tomasz Bilinski, a Polish citizen of Ukrainian origin, who was traveling on official business in a capitalist country, to carry out missions for Bandera's people. As part of the conspiracy he was given the codename "Adam." Initially Bilinski was instructed to select assistants among nationalist Ukrainians in Poland and together with them establish illegal contacts with people living in the Ukraine.

Some time later Bilinski went to the Ukraine where he linked up with Dr Svyatoslav Ignatyevich Panchishin, began the latter's intensive nationalist training, and actually recruited him "to work for OUN UA." After this Panchishin was given a number of assignments, in particular to collect information of a political and economic nature and to study the customs and passport control procedure at the Soviet-Polish border. They also instructed him to choose a reliable man in Kiev for the purpose of creating an illegal group in the Ukrainian capital.

Due tribute must be paid to Svyatoslav Ignatyevich, who correctly assessed the Bandera recruiting agent's actions and reported this to the KGB organs.

In view of the prevailing situation, it was decided for a while not to try to terminate the criminal ties between Bilinski and his accomplices and the Bandera people's center. In the process of this operation, the efforts and resources of Bandera's people, their envoys, and the special services backing them were diverted to the mythical illegal "organization."

As subsequent events confirmed, the OUN UA ringleaders believed that the "underground group" really existed and for a long time pinned serious hopes on it.

With the help of Panchishin, and subsequently of the journalist Yuriy Aleksandrovich Ivanchenko, who had linked up with him, the "group's" activity was fully monitored, just like everything else which arrived for them via illegal channels from the OUN UA.

Stetsko, ringleader of the OUN UA at that time, transmitted personal instructions on the selection and recruitment of sympathizers among USSR Armed Forces servicemen who, according to his scheme, were to undertake "disruptive work in the Army" and the training of armed groups for use on the territory of the USSR and the socialist countries in the event of a sharp deterioration in the international situation. They were also given the task of conducting overt hostile actions designed to undermine the social system in the Ukraine with the aim of secession from the USSR. Panchishin was also accepted into the so-called "central command" of the OUN UA and was later elected deputy leader of the subversive center. He was also coopted into the leadership organ of the OUN UA and appointed "chief judge in country," that is, in the Ukraine. Bilinski's and Panchishin's services were so highly appreciated that they were given the OUN's highest awards: the "gold cross" and the Bandera "silver medal."

During the operation conducted with the active assistance of Panchishin, Ivanchenko, and other Soviet patriots, the subversive activity of the OUN UA against Poland and the Soviet Union virtually "ground to a halt." Suffice it to say that as a result, the actions of more than 20 envoys from the United States, Britain, the FRG, and France were exposed and neutralized. Numerous program and tactical directives were also intercepted, as were materials of the OUN "Grand Assemblies," hundreds of other instructions and advice on matters relating to the conduct of anti-Soviet activity on Ukrainian territory, more than 1,000 copies of diverse OUN literature, technical equipment, and large sums of Soviet and foreign currency sent to the Ukraine to pay for subversion.

In June this year Oleskiv himself sent Panchishin, Ivanchenko, and others via an envoy a large number of items of a program and organizational character adopted in October 1987.

A separate resolution contains directives to be followed in the event of "internal revolution" in the Ukraine which instruct "conscious elements" to seize power and organize their own police and "Ukrainian military subunits." It also envisages that Bandera's people must be ready to transfer to the USSR special "commando groups," trained at OUN paramilitary camps and with service in NATO countries' armies, to take part in military actions. For this purpose the "assembly" recommended to the OUN UA central "command" that a special "Ya. Stetsko Ukrainian defense fund" be set up to channel more than $5 million into subversive activity.

In this regard particular attention is paid to expanding the illegal communications channels with nationalist elements and criminals living in the republic.

Now, in light of the changed situation, a decision was made in conjunction with our Polish comrades to complete the joint operation and bring the materials obtained to the notice of the public at large.

So the news conference is over. Chekists Konstantin Vysotskiy and Aleksandr Minkevich and Soviet patriots Yuriy Ivanchenko and Svyatoslav Panchishin, who conducted this operation for many years, revealed the true face of the OUA UA extremists—the face of a rabid enemy of the Ukrainian people. No, there are no tricks to help these criminals now; Bandera's people will always be indelibly branded with the damning indictment of them by the Ukrainian writer Yaroslav Galan, an ardent Communist internationalist: "Pygmies slobbering in their beards with impotent rage."

'Inflammatory' Nationalist Sentiments Deplored

PM1609114188 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
15 Sep 88 Second Edition p 6

[Correspondent G. Lebanidze article under the rubric "The USSR Is Our Common Home": "Not To Fear Trials"]

[Excerpt] Tbilisi—[passage omitted] It was pointed out at the 19th party conference that it is the job of the whole party and of all Soviet people to shape a socialist internationalist way of life. And a special role in this work is allocated to the Soviet intelligentsia. The general climate of national relations depends to a tremendous degree on its civic maturity and on the depth of its understanding of the fundamental interests of its people and of society as a whole.

Even today, under conditions of glasnost, it is not rare for a demagogue, a timeserver, a windbag, or a hitherto totally unknown homespun "intellectual" to force his way onto a rostrum or onto the pages of a press organ in pursuit of cheap popularity, to attempt under the slogan of glasnost to make irresponsible statements and manipulate farfetched, invented problems, and to endeavor to sow both discord and strife in people's minds.

"My people will not forgive me for keeping quiet...," he holds forth. And "on behalf of and per procurationem" his "own" people, he starts talking all kinds of nonsense designed for gullible people—frequently without receiving a proper rebuff. What prevents people from hissing and driving him from the rostrum in one case is...a sense of etiquette and, in another, cowardice or—which is probably worse—inertia, ingratiation, and silent assent. And no one will ask the latter-day prophet: By what right does he pontificate on behalf of the entire people...?

For umpteen years now Zviada Gamsakhurdia has been allowed no rest because of his reputation as "leader of the nation." He and those who think like him—G. Kostava, G. Chanturiya, and others—employ an original method. On learning, for example, that the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee and the republic Council of Ministers were planning measures to further improve teaching of the native language and history of Georgia in educational institutions, they at once raised a heartrending cry: "Help, the Georgian language is in danger and is being outlawed! The history of Georgia is being falsified...."

Another time it was like this. On learning that in order to protect the ancient David Garedzhi architectural complex from destruction it was planned to move the firing range situated close to it, they at once kicked up a fuss so as to secure priority in formulating that question. Or let us take the construction of the Transcaucasus Main Railroad. There is no denying that the planners made a blunder—they failed to take account of ecological problems, of pollution of the waters of the Aragvi. The public—scientists, engineers, cultural figures—spoke out about this in a well-reasoned manner and with knowledge of what they were talking about. But the aforementioned "defenders of the people's interests" cannot sleep, and they again try to create the impression that they more than anyone are concerned about protecting nature.

I will point out that on the aforesaid and other similar issues Z. Gamsakhurdia and others like him prefer in the majority of cases to speak "with their people" by way of the foreign mass media and supply them with falsified "facts" and slanderous fabrications. And these in turn, endeavoring to lend "weight" to the figure of Z. Gamsakhurdia and flattering his vanity, as the journalist D. Ioseliani wrote in the republic newspaper KOMUNISTI, elevate him to the rank of "outstanding Georgian writer," "national hero," and so forth.

I also wish to speak of something else: We far from always observe tact when speaking of interethnic relations, and we lack culture here. In the article "It Is Not the Dead But the Living Who Need This..." in KNIZHNOYE OBOZRENIYE No 25, dealing with writers who were repressed in the thirties, the journalist G. Nekhoroshev chatted with E. Beltov, staffer of the journal DRUZHBA NARODOV, and asked him what was, to put it mildly, an irregular question: "Since we have mentioned national literatures, could you specify which one suffered most? For there are many myths to the effect that the Armenians and Azerbaijanis suffered more, because Stalin was a Georgian."

Did my colleague think what food such a question could give to enemies of our society? For these enemies' only concern is to somehow disunite the peoples and sow dissension among them. At the height of the events connected with Nagorno-Karabakh such inflammatory thoughts were particularly dangerous and fraught with sad consequences for multinational republics, and particularly for Georgia, where people of more than 80 nationalities live and work side by side and where 448,000 Armenians and 250,000 Azerbaijanis live compactly with Georgians in Akhaltsikhskiy, Akhalkalakskiy, Bogdanovskiy, Marneulskiy, Gardabanskiy, Bolnisskiy, and other rayons. It is true that the question received an appropriate answer from the interviewee, but those words resounded throughout the country.

Yes, Stalin was a Georgian. His pseudonym derives from the Dzhugashvili surname. Translated from ancient Georgian, "dzhuga" means "steel." So let no one have any doubt about Stalin's nationality. But can this serve as grounds for claiming that while in power he spared and protected Georgians from violence and repression? Of course not! I am familiar with numerous archive documents, and I testify in all responsibility that during the period of the personality cult Georgia and its people suffered not a jot less than the inhabitants of other parts of the country. More than 50,000 people were subjected to repression in the small republic, and 20,000 of them were shot.

Prominent party, soviet, and Komsomol workers and literary and art figures were annihilated during that period, and almost all the people's commissars and many scientists and writers died.

When it comes to national questions, it is particularly important to take a stand and display high responsibility and circumspection of judgment. This warning is addressed to those editors and leaders of the mass media who allow far-reaching generalizations and hasty conclusions in their articles on a particular republic. In my view, their credo was formulated quite clearly by a newspaper editor in a recent transmission of Georgian television's "Dialogue":

"I take no stand!"

And the television commentator was, of course, right to retort:

"How can this be—an editor without a stand?"

Our splendid poet Georgiy Leonidze once remarked:

"When you speak about your people's shortcomings, shout at the top of your voice and let all your compatriots know about them. But if you notice them, these shortcomings, in another people, be tactful, tell only your friends about them, and only of that nationality, and tell them this in a whisper, in their ear, and they will understand you correctly and not take offense."

Is this not consonant with the thought expressed in the 19th party conference resolution "On Interethnic Relations": "In the spirit of Leninist tradition it is necessary to struggle above all against 'one's own' nationalism and chauvinism, and this must be done primarily by representatives of the corresponding nationality"?

Excesses also occur in interethnic relations because we all are insufficiently acquainted with each other and with the history of the other peoples and ethnic groups inhabiting our common motherland.

Good relations were established from the earliest times between the intelligentsia of Georgia and Russia. Such great sons of Russia as Pushkin and Griboyedov, Lermontov and Tolstoy, Tchaikovsky and Chaliapin, Chekhov and Gorkiy stood at their cradle of these ties. How many lines proceeding from the very depths of their heart they devoted to Georgia!

However, we all know that during the years of voluntarism and stagnation these traditional ties among the country's polyglot intelligentsia began to weaken. Great efforts must be made to rectify the situation. Is it possible to justify in any way, for example, the fact that little more than half the invited guests—writers and poets from Moscow, Leningrad, and other union republics—came to the recent Vladimir Mayakovskiy all-union literary festival in the village of Bagdadi, where he was born, and in Kutaisi, where he spent his youthful years?

The poet Irakliy Abashidze was right to say: "It is very important to foster and still further deepen and strengthen international feelings and ties. Particularly for writers.... The seeds of the peoples' friendship and fraternity must be sown in people's hearts from childhood."

In this context the practice of creating school hotels in Tbilisi seems to deserve great attention, support, and approval from the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee. Children from various republics are invited to them for a certain time. During joint studies and relaxation they get their first lessons in international friendship. Perhaps it is from such fragments that the friendship and fraternity of our country's peoples are taking shape and must take shape?

Arbatov Discusses 'Political' Keys to Progress

PM1409102188 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 13 Sep 88 Morning Edition p 2

[Academician G. Arbatov "Polemical Remarks": "A Non-Economist's Reflections on the Economy"]

[Text] The debate on economic issues in our country has perhaps never before been as intensive as it is now. It has reached the highest levels—the 27th CPSU Congress and the 19th party conference, as well as Central Committee plenums. And the press, of course.

Soviet readers have shown keener interest in few other topics over the last few years. Moreover, the debate has been gradually spreading to issues going beyond the purely economic framework. This is perfectly logical. In my view, many of the difficulties plaguing our national economy and, of course, the ways to overcome them should not be sought in the economy itself. They lie also in politics, law, ideology, and even psychology.

Economists, as well as representatives of other social sciences, are now subject to frequent and serious criticism. They no doubt deserve this criticism (even though

it must be remembered that the development of these sciences was deformed and suppressed for so many years on end). But I do not believe that even if our best economic scientists had offered the most accurate, substantiated, and objective recommendations concerning all issues of the national economy on a silver platter, as it were, the management superstructure would have proved ready to implement them today. Hitherto it has actually proved incapable of implementing even many party decisions having the force of directives!

There are probably valid reasons for this. An appropriate model of the economy (later dubbed the administrative edict model) was created at a given stage in history and in truly exceptional circumstances for the sake of implementing rapid industrialization and consolidating defense. Prolonged and very strong political and ideological pressure was applied in this process to shape the appropriate organizational structures, management methods, and normative economic management designed to service this specific type of economy and no other.

The question of whether any alternative ways were available is something which historians are now busy trying to clarify. From the viewpoint of today's practical work, the essential point lies elsewhere: Can the radical economic reform, conceived and on the whole already confirmed as a party directive, be "grafted" onto the administrative edict economy created at an earlier stage?

To all appearances the answer is no. I think that the difficulties being encountered in the introduction of fundamentally new elements of reform (enterprises' independence, economic accountability and self-capitalization, and so on) in the national economy and by the new forms of economic activity (like leasing, contracts, cooperatives, joint enterprises) are far from accidental. These difficulties express more than just the inability or ill will of individual officials. These elements and forms are simply alien to the administrative edict economy, they find it tremendously difficult to graft themselves onto its trunk, and, judging by everything, they will be swiftly and mercilessly rejected by the old organism unless there is constant support "from above."

This being so, the first conclusion that suggests itself is: In order to ensure the reform's success it is probably necessary to back the already existing act of political will, the party decision on the need for its implementation, by appropriate political influence. And even by administrative influence. It is probably unlikely that the old economic superstructure will be demolished and refashioned without administrative and political pressure.

I think that for some time, and in order to accomplish this task, important subdivisions of the Council of Ministers and the Gosplan should become a kind of "demolition squads" to ensure that the "construction site" is cleared. In other words these organs, using the force of power, would demolish everything that hinders reform—obsolete organizational structures and management methods and the entire normative system of bureaucratic edict practice.

Another conclusion is: It is probably necessary to take to its logical conclusion the elaboration of the strategy (and possibly the tactics) for the practical implementation of economic reform, for transfer from the old to the new economic model.

Important steps were taken in this direction recently, especially at the 19th party conference and the CPSU Central Committee July Plenum. Mainly as regards the more accurate definition of paramount priority tasks: improvement of food supplies, expansion of consumer goods production, and development of the services sphere.

The conference also raised other fundamental questions of economic strategy in the transition period. One of them concerns the contradiction developing between the desire to fulfill the 5-year plan elaborated earlier and the progress made in implementing economic reform. There can be no argument that this contradiction is not easily reconcilable. Especially when life makes us choose which is preferable.

In the context of this problem, an eminent U.S. economist who has long been a benevolent observer of the Soviet economy's development said this in the course of a private conversation: "You are trying to rebuild your home while still living a normal life inside it. If I were you, I would move out temporarily." I personally (bearing in mind that there is nowhere else for us to move to) feel inclined to draw a different parallel—with the basic rule of obstetrics. When there is no alternative, the main concern is to save the mother—she can give birth to other children. The conclusion that suggests itself by extension is that the reform is probably still more important than the current plan. Especially since this "baby"—as is already evident now—suffers from numerous genetic defects inherited from the administrative edict practice: gross indicators, structural defects and imbalances, orientation not so much toward society's real needs as toward departmental interests and at times even simply toward statistically impressive figures. Is it necessary to go all out to save this "baby"; is it worth the sacrifice of reform and restructuring?

It is a different matter that the plan should not be wrecked but should be thoroughly, sensibly, and at the same time decisively revised. It is impossible to manage without such a maneuver in the prevailing situation. The best solution would probably be to look at the remaining 2 and ½ years of the 5-year plan period, from the viewpoint of the reform's implementation, as a kind of transition period making it possible to cast off the burden of the old by the beginning of the next 5-year plan period and to advance toward the solution of priority tasks.

The conference also raised another important question of economic strategy—how to ensure transition from the omnipotence of central departments to the independence of enterprises. This question, in addition to the imposition of proper order in the state orders system, also relates to the question of eliminating unnecessary management links and cutting back the apparatus—a question which affects the future of tens and even hundreds of thousands of people liable to be relieved of their jobs. A difficult choice has to made here also, and I think that it would be not only more humane but also economically more sensible and useful to bear the cost of paying more generous allowances and pensions rather than to artificially delay the elimination of unnecessary bureaucratic organizations. As a rule, what is unnecessary is not only useless but is actively harmful!

Another question of strategy. There is a broad enough range of well-known painful problems: For example, the unbelievable losses of vegetables, fruit, and other agricultural crops, the grain imports which have become chronic, the "sponsorship" jobs, the fantastic scale of incomplete construction work which is ruining us, and so on. These problems are resolved everywhere else in the world without any special efforts—after all, we are not talking about creating a "perpetual motion machine." It is time that we solved them, too. It is not just a matter of simply adding a few new programs and resolutions to the multiplicity of already existing ones—we already have too many programs and resolutions. These problems must be solved at long last. What is needed for this purpose? Implacability toward the inexcusable state of affairs which, for some reason, has become customary. As well as administrative and material punishment for the culprits—right to the very top.

A third conclusion—the cost of the time factor has increased. The majority of our people are probably perfectly well aware that it will be many years before we manage to resolve tasks like the implementation of all-embracing economic reform, the solution of problems which have been building up over many years, the structural changes in the national economy, and the modernization of machine building. But at the same time there is growing impatience and dissatisfaction with the results of the work done in the economy. This dissatisfaction (and this was also stated at the party conference) is justified—3 and ½ years represent a long enough time period to have produced more tangible results than the ones we have achieved. Even though it is impossible to overlook these results—this would be as extreme as complacency in the other direction.

Time is becoming the decisive factor. We cannot let people be disillusioned, we cannot allow moods of disbelief and skepticism. The very concept of restructuring is very largely based on encouraging the creative activeness of the masses and involving them by all possible means in work on the transformation and renewal of society.

By way of amplification, here are four more problems.

First. About competition.

We all have gotten used to thinking that V.I. Lenin's remark that monopoly leads to decay applies to capitalism alone. For a long time, however, we failed to realize that no other country is likely to have experienced monopolization on the scale we have experienced it. We have already seen for ourselves in practice that socialist monopoly is the source of almost as much decay as capitalist monopoly. Here we have an important source of negative phenomena in spheres like prices, quality standards, and the state of scientific and technical progress. And the ultimate and logical development of unchecked monopoly is total disregard of consumers' interests.

I therefore think that it would be no exaggeration to say that there will be no restructuring of the economy without a considered and consistently applied antimonopoly policy. What should such a policy include?

Obviously, legislative prohibition of monopoly practices in all their manifestations and sufficiently harsh punishment for any breach of these laws.

Further, introduction of new forms for the organization of production, legislatively excluding or limiting monopoly. Even under the jurisdiction of extant sector ministries.

These measures should primarily affect the entire sphere of services and commodity production and a sizeable proportion of all material production. I do not think that there can be any arguments against "trust-busting" antimonopoly measures affecting "hopeless" monopolists like Aeroflot, Inturist....

Finally, it is necessary to create right away conditions to ensure that our producers are forced to compete with foreign firms, including firms from capitalist states. This can be done by introducing a realistic exchange rate and convertibility of the ruble. Then purchasers will have a choice: to acquire an article—we are talking about means of production and consumer goods alike—either made at home or imported from abroad but, if its quality is better, paying a higher (at times even much higher) price.

The second problem is the existence of vast deformed spheres of economic activity which have degenerated into something parasitical, harmful to society, and contrary to its spiritual and moral mainstays. These are primarily the spheres of **trade, public catering, and a sizeable proportion of services.** Everybody seems to be aware of the prevailing situation, individual problems are publicized (the press recently reported, citing the chief of Moscow's Administration for Combating Embezzlement of Socialist Property and Speculation, that an inspection had shown 57 out of 58 sellers defrauding purchasers). But people refrain from making

a principled assessment of the state of affairs and drawing practical conclusions. Meanwhile, the prevailing situation can wipe out any achievements by industry and agriculture. There will be no success in solving the most important tasks, linked with raising the standards and improving the quality of Soviet people's life, without profound restructuring and genuine revolution in these spheres. And this is not all; here we are face to face with a section of life, which largely determines the social and moral climate in our society, having become the breeding ground for corruption and a source of social tension.

The restructuring of these spheres is a complex question, and it is yet to be seriously discussed even by the press. This is a pity. A substantial debate is needed here.

The third problem concerns Soviet people's living standards. It is on everybody's mind, if for no other reason than the ongoing press debate about prices. It seems to me that a number of our economists are frightened by the sight of the monster which they helped bring into being: The reform of the price formation system which they suggested ended up in the bureaucracy's offices and was swiftly transformed into a proposal to increase prices—in addition to price rises which are quietly slipping through, spontaneously as it were.

The very assumption in the debate on price-fixing reform that restructuring must require new sacrifices is incorrect. I certainly do not mean that there is no need for radical reform of the price formation system (even though the outline of such a reform is still not perceptible in the ongoing debate). Price changes must take place not to the detriment of people's living standards but within the framework of their overall enhancement. This is a very important question, not only a social but also an economic issue. Without raising living standards it will probably be impossible to reach the modern frontiers in economic management.

Let me anticipate the question: Where are the resources, where are we to find the funds to advance while we are at the same time making good the deficiencies which have developed over the past years?

Now we need certain major sources of resources. The main one—and this is said increasingly often and increasingly loudly by our economists—is the cancellation (in total and forever or temporarily and partially) of many costly but ineffectual national economic programs and construction projects. We unfortunately have many, too many of them. I am no longer talking about gigantic projects, "projects of the century" like the Baykal-Amur Railroad or the reversal of river courses from north to south or from east to west. There is a need for reinterpretation of the program for boosting the non-Chernozem Zone—it does need boosting very much, but hitherto the program has not been of much help. Things ended up being either not quite planned or not quite implemented. People are justified in citing not just individual projects under the Ministry of Land Reclamation and Water Resources but its entire activity (no more and no fewer than 2 million workers and an annual budget running to R10 billion!) as a blatant example of wasting money. It may be worth giving attention to the suggestion that its activity should be channeled into highway building, for example.

For a long time there has been a pressing need for an open and public discussion to "take stock" of all "never-ending construction" projects, especially the major ones, let alone the gigantic projects (gigantomania is one of our very dangerous diseases). Another source is the cancellation of surpluses in the defense sphere resulting from active utilization of political opportunities to ensure security. This is not easy, but the new thinking paves the way. Together with a rigid but sensible savings regime in all spheres of life, this would probably secure the "initial accumulation" necessary for restructuring.

In this context, attention should be given to an idea put forward by a number of our economists about the more active utilization of the potential of foreign economic ties. Especially since the funds released as a result of the cancellation of unnecessary (or not all that necessary) programs and construction projects cannot be transformed into useful commodities and services at once. The utilization of foreign trade reserves, including credits, would help us "get by." But a lot can also be done without credits—by sharply reducing the imports of equipment (we have stockpiled mountains of it).

And the fourth problem. The administrative edict economy used non-economic coercion—administrative and judicial repressions—as its requisite tool. They were used in different forms, ranging from trials of dissenters (beginning with the Chayanov-Kondratyev trial) to the monstrous excesses of dekulakization and diverse forms of requisitioning and restrictions on individual farming. There was also the widespread practice of persecution and reprisals against economic managers who displayed initiative and enterprise, whose work demolished bureaucratic restrictions and whose successes were a challenge to the administrative edict system.

This resulted (until quite recently, and this practice has still not been fully overcome) in hundreds of trials against plant directors like Chebanov in Cherkassy or Chebanenko in Gorkiy, leaders of gold prospecting artels and cooperatives, and kolkhoz chairmen (like Khudenko and Snimshchikov, or the Starodubtsev brothers from Tula Oblast). Let alone those who were under investigation for months on end, whose nerves were worn out and whose health was ruined (hardly a single one among the country's famous kolkhoz chairmen escaped this fate). A new practice developed in law enforcement cases, whereby an investigation (by an entire investigating team) focused not on a crime but on a man—since existing normative acts are confusing and contradictory, some not-too-scrupulous people can knock together a case against virtually any economic manager.

Taking into account the enormous economic and social damage done by this practice, I would like to suggest the setting up of a commission under the CPSU Central Committee to review these cases and to rehabilitate and restore the good names of those unfairly sentenced in economic cases, as well as to eliminate the threat of reprisals still hanging over enterprising economic managers in their quest. A solution to this problem should probably be provided by the legal reform that is being prepared.

In conclusion, I would like to repeat: In order to be successful, the radical economic reform and the entire restructuring policy need, more than anything else, the total confidence of people—millions and millions of people—in the party's political course. Not only in terms of lofty ideas like devotion to socialism and patriotism—we have all that. Today there is also faith in restructuring, in the correctness of the party's chosen path for the renewal of society. This is a major gain of the last few years. But it is important to add to it some more prosaic and specific elements. Working people must be confident that if today they take on the rearing of a cow or, entering into a family contract, they set up a stock unit, organize a cooperative, or start exercising their rights as stewards of an enterprise, **none of this will be abolished tomorrow or the day after.**

So far many people lack such confidence. Not because the past has taught them many nasty lessons and people can no longer be convinced that something is permitted: Innovations must be encouraged, and not only morally. Especially since another cause of the mistrust lies in the persisting gap between talk and action, in the fact that many innovations have a built-in "fly in the ointment." And this applies both to state orders whose scope goes beyond the framework of what is sensible, and inordinate taxation, and the clever instruction which blatantly goes against the essence of a new law or resolution. Let alone the ongoing—despite all assurances and appeals—interference by numerous offices in the affairs of enterprises, kolkhozes, cooperatives, and "individually working" citizens. All this can be stopped only through the exercise of power—not, of course, in the spirit of the past of sad memory, but sensibly and in fitting forms, and by instituting measures of political influence in parallel with economic measures.

Workers' Views on Election of Economic Leaders

PM1909135988 Moscow TRUD in Russian 15 Sep 88 p 2

[Article by the All-Union Center for the Study of Public Opinion under the rubric "Public Opinion: A Mirror of Democracy": "Who Is For, Who Against?"; first paragraph is editorial introduction]

[Text] Today we inaugurate a rubric. In opening it the editorial office is beginning a permanent and, we are sure, fruitful cooperation with the All-Union Center for the Study of Public Opinion on Socioeconomic Questions (VTsIOM). TRUD has already reported on the creation of this center and its aims and tasks. Now the editorial board intends to acquaint readers regularly with the results of public opinion polls conducted by the center's specialists. The rubric "Public Opinion: A Mirror of Democracy" will carry materials reflecting people's different viewpoints on the fundamental and most important questions of the life of the country and society—questions which concern each of us particularly now in the period of the resolute restructuring of the economy and the social and spiritual sphere. The first publication is devoted to the elections of leaders.

Who Is For, Who Against? [subhead]

The study was conducted among various groups of workers in a number of enterprises who have experience in electing their own leaders. Those polled answered a series of questions which included, among others, the following: "How do you view the timing of the widespread introduction in the country of the elective nature of economic leaders?" "Should there or should there not be elections of leaders until the enterprise acquires full independence?" "Do you agree that the practice of the election of economic leaders produces major positive changes?" and "Could there be serious negative consequences?"

An analysis of the answers showed that the attitude toward elective appointments is not strictly uniform. Not very many people are categorically "for" or "against." The majority view is that people see both the merits and shortcomings of the innovation and stipulate certain conditions for its implementation. Here are the kinds of attitude toward the elective nature of economic leaders which emerged, for example, among engineers, technologists, designers, economists, and other nonmanagement [ryadovoy] specialists (in percentages):

Unreservedly in favor of elective appointments (A) 25

Quite firmly in favor (B) 53

Uncertain, undecided (C) 8

Quite firmly opposed (D) 8

Unreservedly oppposed (E) 3

Indifferent (F) 3.

The figures are different among other groups of working people. Among workers the figures are: A—25, B—55, C—7, D—5, E—0, and F—8. Among junior managers (foremen, works superintendents, section chiefs): A—19, B—51, C—8, D—13, E—3, and F—6. Among senior managers (shop and department chiefs, directors and deputy directors of enterprises) the figures were: A—21, B—42, C—11, D—16, E—5, and F—5.

It is clear from this that the number of workers opposed to elective appointments increases as their official status rises.

Overall, however, there are considerably more in favor of elective appointments than there are opposed to it: Among senior managers the ratio is 3:1, among junior managers 4:1, among nonmanagement specialists 7:1, and among workers 16:1.

Of those polled, 68-70 percent thought that quite a lot of people supported the idea of elective economic leaders. Poll participants believe that the prime support for the principle of election comes from highly skilled workers, nonmanagement specialists, and junior managers. At the same time 27-41 percent of those polled indicate that the idea of elective appointments has quite a large number of opponents and only 9-13 percent say that there are no (very few) opponents. Administrative and management personnel (16-22 percent of those polled), enterprise directors, and workers of ministry and department apparatus primarily do not support that idea.

What is the reason for the quite marked difference in the views of ordinary workers and leaders with regard to elective appointments? This problem needs close study. But it is obvious first and foremost that leaders have a more comprehensive and profound view of the situation that is actually occurring in production and see better the difficulties and problems of introducing this innovation. At the same time it cannot be ignored that the principle of election has a more powerful impact on the personal interests of leaders themselves, some of whom have good reason to be concerned for their position and for that reason oppose this democratic form of cadre selection.

Department To Collect, Publish Crime Statistics

PM1609152088 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 10 Sep 88 Morning Edition p 2

[Interview with V. Guryev, deputy chairman of the USSR State Committee for Statistics, by F. Ivanov: "Glasnost About Crime"—date, place not given; first two paragraphs are editorial introduction]

[Text] At the moment we can only speculate as to how many criminals, drug addicts, or prostitutes there are in the country—all this information is hidden from our eyes in the safes of various departments.

But now a decision has at last been adopted on setting up a department of moral statistics at the State Committee for Statistics and to collect and analyze such information and prepare it for publication. V. Guryev, deputy chairman of the USSR State Committee for Statistics, explains.

[Guryev] Moral statistics is not a new area of work for us, but an old one that had been substantially forgotten. The collection and processing of data on crime and other socially dangerous phenomena was provided for in the "Decree on State Statistics," signed as long ago as 1918. I have in front of me the pamphlet "Suicide in 1922-1926." At that time such information was available to every citizen of our country. However, at the beginning of the thirties, when rights and the law began to be replaced by tyranny and lawlessness, it did not suit Stalin and his underlings for these data to be available to everyone. The moral statistics subunits were abolished, and this work was handed over to the relevant departments. The rebirth of the department of moral statistics within the framework of the State Committee for Statistics is in my view a real manifestation of the policy of glasnost and democratization of society.

[Ivanov] All the same, what information falls within the competence of the moral statistics department?

[Guryev] One group of data concerns various socially dangerous phenomena: alcoholism, drug addiction, toxic substance abuse. It could also include information about prostitution, venereal diseases, suicide, vagrancy, and moonshining. Another group of data concerns administrative misdemeanors. One of the main avenues of work for the department will be the collection and analysis of information on the crime rate in the country. We are interested in the number of crimes, the number of people convicted and victims, social portraits of criminals, data on corrective labor institutions. We must also analyze the level of social protection of the individual in our society, and therefore we will process court statistics and data on the legal profession.

A separate avenue includes information on the distribution of religion in the country. We are interested in the number of religious societies and clergy, the number of services and their participants, across all the religions.

[Ivanov] When will we first be able to study the results of your work?

[Guryev] We have in fact already begun to publish some data, in particular on the crime rate, in our data collections. We are held back mainly by the fact that a large proportion of moral statistics are still not open. Proposals have now been submitted for these data to no longer be regarded as secret. We are convinced that they should all be available to people.

Unfortunately moral statistics are still scattered over many departments. We are to gather them all together at the State Committee for Statistics. We are now cooperating actively with the MVD, the Ministry of Justice, the Prosecutor's Office, the Ministry of Health, and the Council for Religious Affairs, and information is already gradually beginning to come in our direction. True, there are problems here too—there are not enough specialists, after all, we need not only economists and statisticians, but also analysts in the sphere of law and religion.

Nonetheless we have already submitted to the government the first selection of statistics, which we think is very interesting. I hope that by the end of the year we will be able to supply information regularly to the open press too.

Brezhnev Connection Aided Former Kray Chief

PM1909152188 [Editorial Report] Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 16 September 1988 Second Edition carries on page 6 under the rubric "From Local Newspapers" and under the headline "'Sochi Case'—Lessons And Conclusions" a 4,500-word interview conducted by CHERNOMORSKAYA ZDRAVNITSA correspondent N. Gubin 10 September 1988 with Vladimir Ivanovich Kalinichenko, the USSR general prosecutor's senior investigator for particularly important cases, who was one of the leaders of the investigative groups unraveling the criminal cases in Krasnodar Kray, Uzbekistan, and Kazakhstan involving leaders of party committees.

The interview devotes particular attention to the corruption in the Sochi party organization and the resistance encountered by the investigative group during its inquiries. The links between party leaders of diverse levels are also uncovered, such as those between Medunov, former first secretary of Krasnodar party kraykom, and Merzlyy, secretary of Sochi CPSU Gorkom.

The interview runs in part:

[Gubin] Vladimir Ivanovich, I read in the press that investigators in Uzbekistan are sometimes forced to wear bulletproof vests. Is that so? Was there a real danger for investigative groups examining the "Sochi-Krasnodar" cases?

[Kalinichenko] You know, I am not inclined to dramatize the situation. What's the point of talking about constant threats to investigators and about hired killers?

Of course, investigators sometimes work under conditions of heightened danger. Once, a few years ago, when I was a guest of NEDELYA's page 13, my leadership—for security reasons—did not want my photograph to appear in the newspaper. There has only been one situation in my life in which I anticipated physical violence. But, as you can see, I am alive.

In Krasnodar Kray, the investigation encountered a more terrible—in my opinion—phenomenon than physical annihilation. A large-scale campaign was mounted to discredit those who were trying to expose the corruption. It was decided to pulverize them and crush them ethically and morally.

First, local law-enforcement organ officials assisting the investigation were persecuted. "Compromising material" against them was assembled. Of course, the facts were invented, rigged, and juggled. Then, if you recall, Udalov, deputy chief of the gorispolkom internal affairs administration; Kostyuk, city prosecutor; and other workers were removed from their posts and expelled from the party. Criminal proceedings—which, naturally, subsequently burst like a soap bubble—were instituted against some of them.

This persecution was orchestrated by Medunov and Merzlyy, although other senior officials also helped them. It cannot be said that they all did this for some sort of profit. Many of them were simply at the beck and call of interested parties. By virtue of the apparatus system of work and sycophancy, they often began to work for this grouping blindly. The danger was increased many times over by the fact that Medunov was on friendly terms with the then party and state leaders Brezhnev and Chernenko. He sought their support. In short, having made short work of uncongenial local cadres, he declared "war" on the USSR Prosecutor's Office.

You will recall that a large conference was held in Sochi by the USSR MVD. It discussed the question of the work of resort cities' law-enforcement organs during the summer period. This conference was probably just a mystery to many people. First, no such conferences had been held previously or have been held since. Second, why was Sochi chosen? Third, why did the conference take place with such pomp? Churbanov himself, first deputy minister of the MVD, arrived to conduct it. Medunov himself, who—let us stress this fact—did not attach importance to other departmental conferences of this rank, took an active part in its work. The USSR Prosecutor's Office invited Viktor Vasilyevich Naydenov, then USSR deputy general prosecutor, who held all the threads of the investigation in his hands.

The key to the secrets of this conference must be sought in the lobbies. This is where opposing viewpoints regarding the investigation in Krasnodar Kray came together—the USSR MVD in the person of Minister Shchelokov and his deputy Churbanov and the USSR Prosecutor's Office. The former believed that things should be wound up, the latter thought that the investigation should be continued. So, I believe that the conference with its hundreds of invitees from throughout the country was in fact only organized to exert influence on the deputy general prosecutor. After the official piece, Medunov and Churbanov withdrew to one of the city's dachas. They ordered Naydenov to be invited but he was nowhere to be found. Viktor Vasilyevich had already left Sochi. The attempt to force him to compromise had failed.

Since there had been no reconciliation, the scandal machine was soon at top speed again. People were selected and ordered to write false statements saying that illegal investigative methods had been used on them, that they had been beaten and forced to give false depositions. Moreover the documents were compiled in such a way that they cast a slur not only on individuals but also on the entire investigation as a whole. Medunov sent them to the CPSU Central Committee. Owing to his friendly connections with Brezhnev, Medunov managed "to get rid of" USSR Deputy General Prosecutor Naydenov. He was removed from his post without even an explanation of the reasons for his dismissal. These were

the forces that were activated to save the criminals. Imagine the state of the people working at that time on the "Sochi-Krasnodar" cases?

Soon the Central Committee set up a special commission to check on the activity of the USSR Prosecutor's Office in Krasnodar Kray. This is typical. Most of the people who were summoned to the commission passed through Merzlyy's office. Some he threatened, others he issued with instructions on what to say and what testimony to give. But even so the commission was unable to conclude unequivocally that investigative group workers were guilty of anything. A session of the Central Committee Secretariat was held. Instructions were given to relieve Merzlyy of his post and the USSR Prosecutor's Office was ordered to continue the investigation. The well-planned blow did not fall due to the decency and honesty of many people working in the party Central Committee apparatus, the kraykom, and the gorkom.

Nevertheless, Medunov did not rest. Following the commission he loudly stated at a Sochi party gorkom plenum: "How is it that you Communists were unable to deal the requisite rebuff to USSR Prosecutor's Office officials who overstepped the mark and recreated the year 1937 in Sochi? Moscow investigators come and go but we remain." That is what the kray's top leader said. It appears that no one needs honesty. Or abuses to be uncovered. It appears that there is no party discipline, but there is Medunov and there is his personal party organization.

But we continued our work.

Agriculture

Nikonov, Slyunkov, Others View Feed Harvesters

PM2009083188 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 14 Sep 88 p 3

[TASS report: "Reliable and High-Quality Feed Procurement Equipment for the Countryside"]

[Text] The problem of highly productive and reliable feed harvesting equipment has recently assumed great acuteness in the country's livestock units. The lack of an adequate quantity of such equipment and also its poor quality are effectively retarding an increase in labor productivity, the level of mechanization of work in feed production, and a decrease in losses. For these reasons 50-60 percent of grasses and approximately 40 percent of silage crops are not harvested in a timely fashion. Most of the machines used on kolkhozes and sovkhozes are low in productivity and reliability and do not ensure good quality feed, and many of them have become obsolete.

Now new self-propelled feed combine harvesters that accord with modern demands have been created. Samples of this equipment manufactured by the "Gomselmash," "Ukhtomskiy Lyuberetskiy Plant," and the "Rostselmash" Production Associations and also series-produced modernized self-propelled machines and trailer and tractor-mounted units produced both by USSR Ministry of Tractor and Agricultural Machine Building enterprises and also by using State Agro-Industrial Committee machine building capacities and kray and oblast local capacities were demonstrated at work on 13 September in the grainfields of the "Gorkiy-2" Sovkhoz near Moscow.

The "Polesye-250" self-propelled general-purpose power source developed by the "Gomselmash" collective can work with various tractor-mounted machines throughout the year and is coupled to the PKK-F-90 attachment created by the Lyuberetskiy machine builders. Tests have shown the advantages of these systems in comparison with the equipment now used in livestock units: high productivity and good crushing, owing to which the effectiveness of the resulting feed for feeding livestock is boosted by 15 percent. At the same time plant output quality is by no means perfect, as is illustrated by shortcomings which have been observed.

Other feed harvesting machines were operating on the same plot. The sample of the "Don-680" combine also performed well in terms of productivity and quality of work.

V.P. Nikonov and N.N. Slyunkov, members of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and secretaries of the CPSU Central Committee, took part in looking over the equipment.

The attention of the USSR Ministry of Tractor and Agricultural Machine Building was drawn to the inadequate work in organizing the series production of new feed harvesting machines. This year no less than 500 feed harvesting machines based on the "Polesye-250" power source and the Lyuberetskiy plant's tractor-mounted machine must be manufactured. As yet only five combines have been produced and are operational.

The persistent need to step up work to complete the preparation of mass production of combines at manufacturing plants as of 1989 was pointed out. In this connection the USSR Ministry of Tractor and Agricultural Machine Building and construction organizations have been given the appropriate instructions. The task has been set of providing the countryside with highly productive and reliable machines that would make it possible to fully implement the advantages of progressive feed crop cultivation and procurement techniques, especially those relating to grain with waxy ripe cobs, and thus ensure a further increase in livestock farming productivity.

V.P. Nikonov and N.N. Slyunkov were accompanied by V.S. Murakhovskiy, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the USSR State

Agro-Industrial Committee; I.S. Silayev, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; Yu.I. Mordvintsev and V.I. Pimenov, first deputy chiefs of CPSU Central Committee departments; and V.K. Mesyats, first secretary of the Moscow CPSU Gorkom.

Attend Vegetable Growing Seminar

PM1509152788 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Sep 88 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report: "Discussed at Conference. Equipment of World Standard for the Vegetable Complex"]

[Text] Tosno (Leningrad Oblast), 14 Sep—The creation of an efficient system for producing, procuring, processing, and selling fruit and vegetable products and potatoes within the framework of individual regions is an important link in ensuring the population's uninterrupted food supply. Broad opportunities for this are being opened up by the new organizational formations in the agro-industrial complex. Experience of the activity of one of them—the "Tosnenskiy" Agrocombine, the first one in Leningrad Oblast—was examined in detail at a seminar-conference held here today.

Participating in its work were V.P. Nikonov and N.N. Slyunkov, members of the Politburo and secretaries of the CPSU Central Committee; and Yu.F. Solovyev, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of Leningrad party obkom.

In the "Tosnenskiy" fields and production subdivisions the leaders of a number of RSFSR oblasts, of the gosagroproms of the USSR, the RSFSR, and the RSFSR non-Chernozem Zone, and of the USSR Ministry of Tractor and Agricultural Machine Building, directors of agricultural machine-building plants, leaders of design organizations and scientific research institutes of science and production associations, scientists of the V.I. Lenin All-Union Academy of Agricultural Sciences, and specialists of the agro-industrial complex familiarized themselves with the results of tests of various Soviet and foreign techniques for cultivating and harvesting vegetables and potatoes.

A set of machinery and implements manufactured by USSR Ministry of Tractor and Agricultural Machine Building enterprises and also by Dutch and French firms, which make it possible to considerably intensify vegetable growing and achieve a large harvest of carrots, beets, cabbages, and green and other crops without expending manual labor, were demonstrated on the "Fedorovskoye" Sovkhoz.

The seminar participants' interest was also aroused by machinery and implements for cultivating potatoes, which were shown at work in the fields on the "Agrotekhnika" Sovkhoz. The system of machinery includes powerful rotary plows that stir up dense loams like goose down. Seed tubers are set in the soil along with long-acting fertilizers. Potato-harvesting combines are distinguished by high productivity and economy.

The leaders of the "Tosnenskiy" Agro-Industrial Combine told those present about experience of organizing cooperation with French and Dutch firms. Under a contract with them foreign equipment has now been working alongside Soviet models in the fields of Leningrad Oblast sovkhozes. Such cooperation makes it possible to choose acceptable methods for local conditions.

While inspecting the machines, attention was drawn to the need to make a careful study of progressive technological and machine-building experience and to find as quickly as possible opportunities for creating models that are not inferior to world quality standards. For this all available reserves must be utilized.

Then there was a substantive, detailed discussion of problems of vegetable and potato production and of its comprehensive mechanization by means of creating an efficient system of machinery. The importance of improving selection and seed growing for these crops was noted. It was emphasized that retooling in this sphere is the right way to accelerate movement toward the goal set by the party as the priority task—resolving the food problem as quickly as possible. It was deemed necessary to lose no time in focusing attention on manufacturing machines that have proved themselves in work and to supply potato-growing farms with them. Instructions were also given to examine the existing complexes of machines and techniques for producing vegetables and potatoes with due regard for experience of work with foreign firms. Radical transformations of economic relations in the countryside and the introduction of various forms of contract on a lease basis must be founded on the broad use of the best techniques and equipment and on the achievements of scientific and technical progress.

Participating in the seminar-conference were I.S. Silayev, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers Machine-Building Bureau; V.K. Mesyats and A.F. Voystrochenko, first secretaries of Moscow and Bryansk party obkoms; and senior officials of the CPSU Central Committee.

Progress on Harvest of Feed Crops Described

PM1909134388 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 16 Sep 88 p 2

[Animal expert M. Glinka "Review": "Strength of Ration; All Reserve Potential for the Accumulation of Feed Must Be Utilized"—first paragraph is USSR State Committee for Statistics report]

[Text] By 12 September almost 97 million hectares of grain and pulse crops (excluding corn) had been cut, and 94.4 million hectares of these had been threshed. The kolkhozes and sovkhozes had laid in for the winter 74.4

million tonnes of hay, 83.1 million tonnes of haylage, and 163.9 millions tonnes of silage. On average about 13 quintals of feed units were procured per standard head of livestock in the country's farms, and stocks amounted to 112.5 million tonnes in total. Straw from 74.7 million hectares had been stacked and carted away.

It is no accident that concentrates are called "strong feed." They are what give the animals' ration its "strength." It is especially important to remember this now that the country has taken the course of intensifying livestock raising, and increasing milk yields and weight gain in every way possible: The higher the productivity of livestock, the greater the amount of dry components the ration must contain and the higher must be the concentration of energy and protein in the dry components. How do matters stand with the accumulation of grain feed on the country's farms? Here are the figures from the USSR State Committee for Statistics. By 12 September they had laid in 30.1 million tonnes of concentrated feed from their own harvest this year—this is about 104 percent of last year's level. Exceeding last year's pace, grain feed is being delivered in the RSFSR, Kazakhstan, Georgia, Azerbaijan, Moldavia, Tajikistan, and Turkmenia. An alarming situation has taken shape in the Ukraine, Latvia, Kirghizia, Armenia, and particularly Estonia—in the farms of this Baltic republic grain feed stocks are barely half of last year's level.

In the RSFSR the kolkhozes and sovkhozes in Arkhangelsk, Kursk, Kemerovo, and Irkutsk Oblasts, where the grain feed stocks are over 30 percent lower than a year ago, are particularly behind in building up these stocks. In Krasnoyarsk Kray these stocks are less than a third of last year's. Although in Chita Oblast and Khabarovsk Kray they have accumulated a great deal more grain feed than in the middle of September 1987, this must not be a cause for complacency—these "stocks" amount to only 600 and 900 tonnes. And in Buryatiya and Tuva the imminent winter will arrive but the grain feed bins will be empty.

This is all the more dangerous because in the coming winter they will evidently not be able to count on a major influx of concentrated feed. They will have to count on their strength, and on local reserves. The main one now is corn. The heat that dried the cereal crops favored the development of corn. About 13.25 million hectares of corn has been harvested in the country, of which 12.9 million hectares is for green feed and silage. The situation on plantations varies. In Latvia and Lithuania 91 and 95 percent has been harvested, whereas, for example, in Georgia and Armenia only 7 and 20 percent of crops has been harvested. I do not cite these figures with the aim of praising the former and reproaching the latter, but rather the reverse: In the specific conditions of the current year those who gain are those who let the corn ears swell with grain, who put into the silage trenches plants that have been harvested at the stage of waxy ripeness, who store the threshed corncobs, and who preserve in trenches crushed corn grain with a high moisture content.

The present practice on kolkhozes and sovkhozes is rich with examples of this assiduous approach. I will cite several. In Kostroma Oblast 1,200 hectares of corn were grown—4 times more than last year. In "Rodina" Kolkhoz, Makarevskiy Rayon, this crop produced per hectare 350 quintals of green matter including ears. When the feed has been put in the trenches many farms in the oblast enrich it with carbamide. In Latvia's Rezeknenskiy Rayon the livestock units were 40,000 tonnes of grain short in meeting their requirements. In order to make good this shortage, all farms that keep hogs store mixed silage. They add to it corn at the milky or waxy ripeness stage, beet tops, flax tailings, and the aftergrowth of perennial grasses. In addition, they prepare protein and vitamin granules out of perennial grass tops.

Production systems have started operating in a number of places whose farms cultivate corn for silage in accordance with grain growing techniques. In Bashkiria out of 275,000 hectares devoted to corn, 54,000 hectares are allocated to corn for silage. The results achieved have not been bad—250 quintals of green bulk and 60-70 quintals of cobs per hectare. They are being laid in as cornage [kornazh]. Even in Tyumen this year the corn (here 129,000 hectares are sown to it) formed ears, reaching milk-wax and waxy ripeness. The oblast receives about 200 quintals of this nutritious matter per hectare. Belorussian farms use corn widely for supplementing grain feed stocks. On "Krasnyy Partizan" Kolkhoz in Lepelskiy Rayon, Vitebsk Oblast, for example, they harvest 650-700 quintals of green matter per hectare, while in the fields sown to the hybrid "Moldavian 157"—they obtain a further 70 quintals of cobs per hectare. In Kalinkovichskiy Rayon, Gomel Oblast, just as in many other rayons in the republic, they did not hurry to harvest the corn, they let the cobs reach waxy ripeness and used them for cornage.

The lack of equipment hampers the work. There is a shortage of "Khersonets" combines, IRM-50 grinders, and even PPK-4 attachments for grain combines. The local machine operators get out of the difficult situation in which the machine builders have put them, as best as they can. In particular, they are adapting IRT-165 round-bale choppers. The Ukraine is also looking for ways to overcome these difficulties. Workers at the republican feed research institute proposed equipping the KSK-100 and E-281 feed harvesting combines with recutter drums [barabanami-rekatorami] which literally grind the corn into meal: A day's yield of silage prepared in this way contains up to 6 kg of concentrates. A fine addition that increases the strength of the ration!

Official Data on Harvest, Sowing, Feed Crops

LD1509104388 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1100 GMT 14 Sep 88

["News of the Agro-Industrial Complex" program, presented by Aleksandr Ruvinskiy]

[Text] I will begin with the summarized data of the USSR State Committee for Statistics, which the editorial office has just received.

By the start of this week grain has been harvested on kolkhozes and sovkhozes on an area of nearly 97 million hectares. The yield has been threshed on nearly 87 percent of the area. Unfortunately, harvesting has been lagging behind in some northern oblasts. A good deal of cereals also remains to be harvested in Smolensk Oblast.

A complex situation concerning the harvest has arisen in Eastern Siberia. The summer was fairly cold there which rather delayed the ripening of grain crops. Now, after they have ripened, the weather is creating great difficulties there. In Irkutsk Oblast, for instance, weathermen are even forecasting sleet in the next few days. Corn has been harvested in somewhat greater amounts than last year. Many farms can boast good harvests of this crop. Grain is continuing to flow to the country's storage places. Sales of high-quality wheat are rather higher than last year.

All the seeds required for winter sowing have been laid in and conditioned. Autumn sowing has been completed now on nearly 24 million hectares, which is 61 percent of that planned. In the areas where the optimum time for carrying out operations has already expired sowing has

virtually been completed. Land plowing for spring sowing is proceeding fairly quickly. Thirty-nine percent of that planned for this job has been fulfilled.The first mowing of sown and wild grass has been completed on 80 million hectares and 86 percent of the planned amount of hay has been stored. Altogether 112 million tonnes of various feed crops have been procured, which is somewhat more than in the same period last year. Silage making is in progress everywhere now. There is a good harvest of silage corn and many farms are experiencing difficulties with harvesting and transporting silage material.

The general pace of potato lifting is rather higher than last year in the country.

Altay Grain Harvest Progress Reported

PM1909120188 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 17 Sep 88 Second Edition p 1

[TASS report: "First Million"]

[Text] Barnaul, 16 Sep—The first million tonnes of grain of the new harvest were poured into the state granaries today by the Altay grain growers.

Over 80 percent of the wheat which has come in is of the strong, durum, and valuable strains. The pace of harvesting work in the kray is faster than last year. The increased responsibility of arable farmers, grain procurement workers, and transport workers working on the contract principle is promoting this.